



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2019

No. 94

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, the source of our hopes and dreams, You are the stable influence that gives us peace in a sometimes chaotic world. We praise You for surrounding us with the shield of Your favor and love.

Lord, continue to guide our lawmakers as they trust You to direct their steps. Remind them that You will not withhold good things from the upright. Use them to illuminate the darkness of faulty thinking and to make our Nation and world a better place to live. Sanctify their thoughts as they daily expose themselves to the wisdom and consolation of Your holy Word.

Lord, as we commemorate the 75th anniversary of D-Day, increase our faith in the power of Your loving providence.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The majority leader is recognized.

### NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the Senate voted to confirm Andrew Saul of New York to serve as

Commissioner of Social Security and voted to advance several more highly qualified nominees.

Today we will vote to confirm three other executive branch nominees to important posts at the Departments of State and Interior and at the CFTC, and we will advance three more judicial nominees to fill seats on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia and the Court of Federal Claims.

So the Senate continues to clear the backlog left by more than 2 years of systematic delays and obstruction that extended even to nominees with major bipartisan support—impressive, unobjectionable individuals who had spent months and, in some cases, well over a year on the Executive Calendar were finally granted straightforward votes. The modest rules change the Senate adopted this spring is already making a change.

In 48 session days, from January through April, we were able to confirm just 23 nominees. But in the 20 days immediately following the modest reform, we confirmed 45, about twice as many in less than half the time, and, of course, the number of confirmations has continued to climb in the weeks since then. We need to get these folks on the job for the sake of the country. The President—any President—should be able to stand up a government. The American people deserve to be governed by the government they voted for.

Many of the jobs that have been needlessly held open are not typically the highest profile positions, but they are still hugely important. As I said yesterday, until we confirm David Schenker later today, his confirmation to hold the top Middle East job at the State Department will have been held up for more than a year. This is the Middle East position at the State Department. Yet, as the cloture vote indicated, this qualified nominee carries overwhelming support. The nomination

has been held by Democrats for political purposes. It had nothing to do with the nominee or his qualifications for the position. Given the crisis ranging from Libya to Yemen and almost everywhere in between, it is past time to have an Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs confirmed and on the job.

Later today we will also confirm Susan Combs to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Her non-controversial nomination has been pending in the Senate since July. Listen to this: since July of 2017—2 years, 700 days, just shy of 2 years. But starting tomorrow, she will finally be on the job.

These are the kinds of nominees who once would have moved swiftly through the Senate and certainly by voice vote. I wish we could rediscover that tradition, but one way or another, we will continue to make progress.

### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, in addition to nominations, there are a number of other important items that Congress ought to be able to tackle in the next several weeks. As I have mentioned several times, we need continued negotiations in the Senate, the House, and the White House toward a bipartisan government funding agreement to set up the appropriations process. We will also need to complete a National Defense Authorization Act to address critical national security challenges, rebuild our military's readiness, and modernize our Armed Forces to address the growing challenges posed by great-power competitors like Russia and China.

The headlines remain filled with the unacceptable, unsustainable security crisis and humanitarian crisis down on our southern border. By now, I am confident that every Member of Congress has heard the breathtaking numbers. We have all heard the chaos analyzed 1,000 different ways.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3223

What we haven't seen is any appetite on the Democratic side for actually getting an outcome. We haven't seen the Democrats put aside their reflexive opposition to anything—anything—the President requests and face the facts.

So allow me to repeat some of those facts yet again. We are all hoping they will sink in some time soon. One week ago this morning, border agents encountered the largest group of people attempting an illegal crossing that they have ever, ever seen. They apprehended more than 1,000 individuals—the largest group ever.

For consecutive months now, the men and women who guard our border have apprehended more than 100,000 people—100,000. That is each month—100,000 a month. We are talking about numbers not seen for more than a decade. And, as we all know, in particular, the amount of families and children are consistently record-breaking as well.

The officials whom we trust to protect our borders—not to mention feed, clothe, and house these individuals—have been crying out for months that their Agencies are stretched literally to the breaking point. One processing center that was designed to hold 125 is said to hold 900—900. The Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement has predicted that the program for unaccompanied children may exhaust all of its funding this month—this month—and need to reduce operations.

Here is one newspaper reporting on testimony from the head of the Border Patrol:

The flood of migrants has overwhelmed Border Patrol stations and other Federal facilities, forcing immigration agents to release migrants directly into U.S. border communities with only the hope that they will appear for their immigration court hearings.

So this funding crisis is directly weakening our border security and national security. It is directly worsening the conditions for these men, women, and children, and the authorities are pleading for our help.

I dare say there are not many occasions when the editorial board of the New York Times has chosen to side with the Trump administration, but this crisis is so bad and the next step is so obvious that it has united President Trump, Republicans here in Congress, and the New York Times editorial page. I doubt if we will see that again.

Here was the title of their editorial about a month ago: "Congress, Give Trump His Border Money." They described:

A humanitarian crisis of overcrowding, disease, and chaos. . . . As resources are strained and the system buckles, the misery grows.

They published that editorial while we were finalizing the disaster funding legislation. There was no reason why the funds to alleviate the humanitarian crisis at the border should not have been included in that bill, and yet my friend, the Democratic leader, came to the floor multiple times late last month to call the issue of border funding "extraneous."

Addressing the security crisis and humanitarian crisis is not extraneous. It is essential. Migrants are experiencing overcrowded and underequipped facilities. Our law enforcement humanitarian professionals are crying out for help.

Look, I understand our Democratic colleagues find it extremely difficult to put partisanship aside and work with the President the American people elected. I think the whole country sees very clearly that Democrats in Congress seem to prefer picking fights with this President to actually getting much done. Their partisan spite must not prolong this misery any longer. As long as Democrats continue to drag their feet on this crisis, as long as they keep slow-walking funding that everyone from President Trump to the New York Times sees is necessary, then, my colleagues across the aisle will continue to own the consequences. It is on them.

I hope my Democratic colleagues will allow this legislation to move forward—no more poison-pill policy riders, no more political posturing. It is way past time for action.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last week, a man submitted his 2-weeks' notice to his place of employment in Virginia Beach before going there and shooting 12 people and injuring 4 others. He unloaded dozens of rounds indiscriminately. In addition to having two handguns, he had extended ammunition magazines and a suppressor to muffle the sound of gunfire.

This was the 100th mass shooting in America, coming on the 100th day of the year. This has become a regular part of life in the United States of America—individuals walking into churches and shopping malls and schools and places of employment and shooting indiscriminately such that dozens of innocent lives are lost. In most cases, the same kinds of weapons are used—semiautomatic rifles, extended magazines—weapons or components of weapons that are banned in other countries and that were banned in this country for a period of time because they were believed to have been so dangerous such that they should have been in the exclusive province of the military and law enforcement.

#### REMEMBERING RYAN KEITH COX

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Ryan Keith Cox was 50 years old when he was

shot and killed on May 31. He was known for his soft-spoken nature and his powerful singing voice in his church choir, and he was constantly affecting those around him with small but meaningful gestures of kindness.

The day that he was killed in Virginia Beach, a close coworker of Ryan's, Christi Dewar, was with him when the shooting started. Ryan told Christi and other colleagues to barricade themselves in the break room. Christi implored Keith to join them in the break room, but he said to her "I have to go check on the other ones." Keith left and was soon shot by the gunman as he was assisting other coworkers in reaching safety.

Christi said:

Every time I was upset, [Ryan] would give me a [big] hug. When I was upset about something, he knew exactly what to say to make you smile. He's the type of person who you know would lay down his life for someone, just like he did.

Bishop Williams of Faith World Ministries in Norfolk said that he had known Keith and his family for years. They were close, a very loving family, and had just been "leaders in the church world," Bishop Williams said.

Ryan Keith Cox was 50 years old when he was shot in Virginia Beach.

#### REMEMBERING JOSHUA HARDY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Joshua Hardy was 2 years older. He was 52 years old. He had been working for 4½ years as an engineer and technician for the city of Virginia Beach. He was raised in Hampton Roads. He came from a really big family, and he was described by his friends and his family as being incredibly caring, especially about kids. He didn't have any children of his own, but he often watched over his nieces and nephews.

One of his nieces, Tasha, remembered that he was around a lot. "He cared about me and all of my cousins," she said. "He was like a father figure to me because my dad wasn't around."

In 2011, Joshua actually published a book, called the "ABC Book on Protecting Yourself from Strangers."

The people he worked with remember being so impressed that Joshua had gone above and beyond the call. One of his colleagues in the engineering department, Larry Knight, gave a copy of the book to his daughter and his grandson. He remembers Joshua as just always having a smile on the job:

Joshua was one of the nicest men you would ever care to meet. He was funny and kindhearted. [He] would do anything for you.

#### REMEMBERING LAQUITA BROWN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, LaQuita Brown was 39 years old. She was a public servant from Chesapeake, VA. She had worked in the public works department for more than 4 years. She was a right-of-way agent. Her friends called her "Ms. Worldwide" because she loved to travel. She had

been all around the world, and her social media was plastered with pictures of her travels.

Her father, as any father would be, is absolutely heartbroken by her death.

He said:

She was just everything. She was everything to me. I know nobody's perfect—but from the time she was born, she had no faults.

For the Brown family, the grief surrounding LaQuita's death comes on the heels of LaQuita's brother dying from a hit-and-run driver 3 years ago. Her father said that LaQuita helped him through the grief. "She saved me," he said. "I wouldn't have made it through that [without her]."

In 100 days into the year, we have had 100 mass shootings. It doesn't happen anywhere else in the world except in the United States of America. We can't claim to be helpless, and we can't claim to have no solutions because, if it only happens here and nowhere else, then there must be something different happening here. We can learn. We can adapt.

It has now been 100 days since the House of Representatives passed a universal background checks bill, a universal background checks bill that is supported by 90 percent of Americans and would have a significant downward effect on the number of people who are shot in this country.

We tend to pay attention as a nation and as a body only when something like Virginia Beach happens, when there is a mass shooting of an epic scale—when 5 or 10 or 20 people lose their lives at one time. Yet, since the House passed the universal background checks bill, 10,000 people have been shot and killed in America. That is a stunning number.

There have been 10,000 people shot and killed in America in just the 100 days since the House passed the universal background checks bill, but the vast majority of these individuals were not killed in mass shootings. Most of these were suicides. Most of these were individuals who had taken their own lives with weapons. Others were accidental shootings. Many of them were homicides.

The grief and the pain that comes with all of those is no different than the grief that LaQuita Brown's family is feeling right now. We should care about every single one of these deaths.

The reason I pegged this to the passage of the background checks bill is that we know that background checks save lives in States that have universal background checks, meaning, if you are getting a gun in a commercial sale, you need to prove that you are not a criminal or that you are not seriously mentally ill. In the States that have universal background checks, you have fewer suicides, and you have fewer homicides.

Connecticut is a perfect example. The research shows that once we passed our universal background checks requirement—and we did it

quite a number of years ago—we saw a 40-percent reduction in gun homicides in our State. Similarly, when Missouri went from having a universal background checks requirement to its not having one, the State saw a 40-percent increase in gun homicides.

Not every single one of these 10,000 deaths was preventable, but many of them could have been. It is not that we don't know what to do, and it is not that we don't know what makes this country different; it is just that we are unwilling to take those steps.

Just this past weekend, 52 people were shot in communities across this country. There were 10 deaths from gunshot wounds in Chicago alone. These victims are just as worthy of remembering as the victims in Virginia Beach or in Sandy Hook or in Parkland.

#### REMEMBERING GWAIN BROWN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Gwain Brown was 16 years old. He was a sophomore in high school in Chicago, IL, and he was all hyped up to throw himself the biggest 16th birthday party that his friends had ever seen. At the end of April, he was going to throw down. Yet, on April 1, he was standing in front of a gas station when a gunman opened fire and hit Gwain in the leg and the chest.

One of his basketball teammates thought the initial news of Gwain's death was an April Fools' joke as it happened on April 1. So, when he heard about it, he just went back to sleep.

His friends said Gwain was the life of the party and was so energetic. "I was . . . with him . . . a week ago, and for that to happen in this time period, I'm just in shock."

At a vigil, his elementary school principal read an excerpt of something he had written well in school.

Gwain wrote: "I want to be a good son, always be there for my mom and always be there to take care of her."

#### REMEMBERING JAYLIN ELLZEY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a couple weeks ago, Jaylin Ellzey was a freshman at Fenger Academy High School in Chicago. According to his uncle, Jacob, he was an outgoing, kind-hearted kid. He lived with his mother. He had two sisters and three brothers.

Jaylin is not around anymore because he was one of those victims of gun violence in the city of Chicago.

His uncle said:

Summer in the city, it's just something different. Other kids look forward to going to summer camp. He was just trying to make sure he lived another day.

His uncle, Jacob, began tearing up as he recalled his favorite memory of Jaylin as a small child. Whenever Jaylin and his brother would come stay with their uncle, they would take a bath, and then they would nestle amongst the pillows and the blankets, waiting for their uncle to blast them with hot air from a blow dryer.

"He was just a lovable kid surviving his environment," said his uncle. "And he knew about family. Family was always instilled in him."

Since my life was changed in December of 2012, when 20 first graders were killed in Sandy Hook, I have tried to come down to the floor every couple weeks and tell the stories of victims of gun violence in this country to try to put some personality behind the 10,000 lives that have been lost in the last 100 days, and I told you about 5 of the victims this morning.

Our inaction is complicity. There are tough things, and then there are easy things. I get it that there are some anti-gun violence measures that I would support that are just too hot for some Republican Members, but I don't care what State you are from, 97 percent of your constituents, 80 percent of your constituents—the vast majority of your constituents—support expanding background checks to make sure that if you buy a gun online or you buy a gun at a gun show, you have to go through a 5-minute background check.

All of our constituents, no matter whether we represent a blue State or a red State, support extreme risk protection orders—the idea that you should be able to go to court when somebody is on the verge of lashing out against someone else or going to hurt themselves and take away their guns, at least temporarily. These are things that are not controversial anywhere, except for here, that we could pass.

Since the House passed the background check bill—by the way, with bipartisan support—10,000 people have died, but there have been 109 mass shootings. Thirty-one States have had a mass shooting; 166 kids have been killed or injured; 175 teenagers have been killed or injured.

I am on the floor today to send my heartfelt condolences to the families in Virginia Beach who continue to mourn yet another mass shooting. I express, as I always do, my condolences to the families of gun violence throughout this country. Eighty to ninety people lose their life every day from a gunshot wound.

I am also here today to ask my colleagues to think about why we continue to refuse to have a debate on a piece of legislation that the House passed 100 days ago in a bipartisan fashion.

Even if you don't love the version of the background checks bill that the House passed, bring your own version to the floor—bring a different bill that will address the epidemic of gun violence in this country. All I ask is that you don't do nothing; that you stop your absolute silence in the face of this epidemic of slaughter.

Let the Senate be the Senate. I heard there was a time some years ago when the U.S. Senate actually debated legislation. I have read in the history books that this is supposedly the greatest deliberative body in the world. We are doing no deliberation here. Bill after

bill passes the House of Representatives. None of them come before the Senate for a vote—no healthcare bills, no immigration bills, no anti-gun violence bills.

I get it that the bills that pass the House probably can't pass a Republican-led Senate, but why are we not even trying? Who is in charge here? The special interests who want nothing to happen, the gun lobby, the health insurance companies or are we in charge? We are the ones who were elected. We are the Members of the U.S. Senate. We could choose to have these debates, hash out our differences, and see if there is a proposal that 60 of us could agree on that would do something about this unacceptable level of gun violence that plagues this Nation on a daily basis.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### TARIFFS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday on the floor I said I don't believe President Trump will follow through on his threat to impose tariffs on Mexico. Why? First, because the President has a tendency for bluster. There are many examples of the President taking a maximalist position before eventually backing off and announcing some different solution. Nine times out of ten, after a few months, everyone realizes that the so-called solution isn't real and doesn't work, but the President needs a way out of his bluster. That may well be true with the tariff issue.

Second, most Senate Republicans oppose the President's idea of slapping tariffs on Mexico. They know how that could destabilize our economy and Mexico's and that it could actually make the migration problem worse.

Publicly, the President has continued the tough talk on tariffs with Mexico—he responded to my statement on the floor with a tweet last night—but ultimately I continue to believe he will back off. That has been his MO. When he does, I would urge him to consider a real solution to the border problem, not some fake solution that he and the Mexicans announce, and then it does nothing—they don't follow through, it doesn't have effect, whatever.

Here is a commonsense policy that will actually reduce the problems at the border: Many of the migrants that

arrive at our southern border are fleeing untenable situations—gang violence, drug cartels, corruption, domestic abuse, economic depravity. If you are starving, if you are worried that your child will be mugged, if you are worried that your daughter will be raped, you ain't staying there. The governments of those countries have failed to provide safety or security for people living within their borders in Nicaragua, in Honduras, and in El Salvador. Their citizens—or some of them—feel compelled to embark on a dangerous 1,000-mile journey on foot rather than stay put because staying put is even worse for them.

These are not evil people. The President would like to make them all out to be drug dealers or criminals. Most of them are poor people who are trying to escape the dangers created by the problems of gang violence, economic hardship, social oligarchy.

We Democrats have crafted legislation that would help address the problems in those three Central American countries that are causing the migrants to flee in the first place.

First, we would allow asylum seekers to apply for asylum within their own countries. That thousand-mile trek across Mexico is dangerous. It is often expensive. You have to pay a coyote or buy off drug dealers or other criminals. Let them apply in Honduras, in El Salvador, in Guatemala and not amass at the border. Second, we provide significant security assistance to Central American countries to build their capacity, crack down on the gangs and drug cartels and human trafficking that is endemic in those countries, and we would increase the number of immigration judges and personnel to reduce the current backlog of cases at the border.

These policies make eminent sense, and unlike the President's plan to impose tariffs on Mexico, our proposals do not threaten the U.S. economy. We would urge our Republican colleagues to join us in this commonsense solution.

When the President inevitably retreats from his tariff threat—which may be as soon as this afternoon—we should proceed on these commonsense policies, not some fake thing that sounds good in an announcement and then goes away like we have seen over and over again when the President conducts foreign policy—North Korea being one of the most notorious examples.

Over the past year, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, despite some positive domestic reforms, has too often acted like a brute in the Middle East rather than a stabilizing force.

I understand that Saudi Arabia worries about Iran. I share those concerns about the Iranian Government, but the Saudis have all too often reacted in the wrong way. In Yemen, the Saudis are fighting a proxy war that has resulted in untold human suffering and the slaughter of innocents of many chil-

dren. Internally, the Saudi Government has conducted a widespread campaign of political repression, including the imprisonment of women's rights campaigners. We all know how the Saudis were responsible for the vicious torture and chilling murder of a journalist and American resident Jamal Khashoggi.

Despite these gross violations of international norms and values, the Trump administration has just cozied up with Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman and offered almost no criticism.

We have just learned, according to reports, that the Trump administration approved seven transfers of American nuclear technology to the Saudis, including two after Khashoggi's murder. Now the administration is using its favorite tool, claiming emergency powers to justify another 22 arms sales to the Saudis and others, including precision-guided munitions for Saudi's operations in Yemen.

Has the Trump administration lost all perspective when it comes to Saudi Arabia—providing excuses and cover for the brutal murder of a journalist and American resident, aiding and arming the Saudis in a human rights tragedy in Yemen, which will only come back to hurt him in the long run. What are we doing here?

Congress has already voted, in bipartisan majorities, to unwind America's involvement in Yemen, which, of course, the President vetoed, and now we ought to vote to disapprove these arms sales.

The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Senator GRAHAM, urged by our ranking member of Foreign Relations and our leader on this issue, Senator MENENDEZ, has thankfully announced the bipartisan effort to do just that. I strongly support that effort.

Let me say, my Republican friends, over the last years of the Obama administration, bitterly complained about the way President Obama used Executive authority. The amount of Executive authority used by President Obama could fit in a thimble compared to the abuse of Executive authority by President Trump. Yet it seems, in the past, our Republican colleagues who so criticized Obama for much less have been totally silent when President Trump abuses Executive authority, but now maybe there are some green shoots.

Maybe some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate are waking up to the idea that in America we have a three-branch government, not a one-branch government, and maybe some of our Republican colleagues are recognizing that and beginning to act—the possible green shoots. Two instances; one is tariffs. Our Republicans don't like these tariffs. Will they have the guts, if the President implements them, to oppose the President? We will see.

Now, on Saudi arms sales, a number of Senate Republicans are beginning to

say we need to constrain the President the way the Congress has traditionally constrained the executive branch. I am hopeful, but I am also skeptical.

If the past is prologue, my Republican friends will ultimately back down. Leader MCCONNELL, his MO, will let a few of them off the hook so they can go home and say they supported it but never enough to make sure Congress provides an effective check on the President. It is sort of a wink and a nod. Well, let's hope this time it is different. Let's hope that these murmurings among Republicans about the Saudi arms sales and about the tariffs are real, and they will actually stand up to him, which is what a Congress should do even when they are of the same party as the President.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the climate, as I have said so many times, no threat poses a greater danger to our planet than that of climate change. The last 5 years have been the warmest on record. There is more carbon dioxide in the air than any point in human history. Our children and grandchildren will live with the consequences of the decisions we make today. We need all hands on deck—the Federal Government, local governments, municipalities, corporate leaders, global efforts—if we are to meet the challenges of climate change head-on, but for years our government has been too slow to act and more often than not we have done nothing or very little.

Just yesterday, President Trump once again—not based on fact, based on whim, as he so often acts—voiced a dangerous skepticism about climate change while meeting with Prince Charles.

Now, one of the biggest reasons for the slow progress on climate policy has been the oppressive grip of Big Oil, Big Gas, and Big Coal, on our political system. They spent untold millions to debunk climate science and torpedo climate legislation. One of the largest perpetrators has been the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which never reveals its donors and has acted all too often as a front for Big Oil.

Recently, as public support for action upon climate change has grown even more overwhelming, the chamber is starting to sing a different tune. They have launched a campaign for cleaner energy sources. They have added a new section to their website, "Addressing Climate Change." They now even say that, on this issue, "inaction is not an option." Well, I could not agree more; inaction is not an option, but color me skeptical about the chamber.

I hope to see the chamber follow its public stance with real action, but until I do, I fear this change is merely cosmetic. All too often, the big oil and big coal companies don't act themselves, although some do, but they let the chamber do their dirty work for them. So today SHELDON WHITEHOUSE

and I, along with a number of our colleagues, will be sending a letter to the chamber, calling on them to speak out against the administration's effort to undermine the "National Climate Assessment." It is not enough to simply say: Oh, well, it is a problem.

Inaction is not an option. They must do something concrete. This is a concrete action we are proposing that will make a difference. I read in today's New York Times that companies are now beginning to plan for how climate change will cost them more money in the next 5 years. They don't think it is no problem. They don't think it is a 30-year problem. These companies and their interest in their profits—that is how they should be interested, although I would like to see them a little more interested in workers and communities and climate. These companies, for their own bottom lines, are saying climate change is real, and we better do something.

Well, one way the chamber can move things along is to speak out against this administration in its efforts to undermine the "National Climate Assessment." For years, this study has been the gold standard for climate research within our government. It is not partisan. It is factual; it is based on science; and it assesses the long-term threats to climate change.

The President is sort of, on climate, a member of the Flat Earth Society, just denying the facts. It would be as if Columbus sailed, and the President still said the earth is flat. That is how he is acting on climate. Well, the Chamber ought to break with that. They ought to let science and facts determine how we act.

This is a moment when the Chamber could actually use its influence to convince the administration to reverse course. If the business community said this, it would make a big difference. So this is a moment. Let's see if the chamber really wants to prove that they are for climate change. Let's see. Let's see. If they don't, we ask their members who say they believe in climate—and who are even planning for the problems we face—to put pressure on them to do it. Let's hope. Let's hope.

Now, before I yield the floor, I just want to send a kudos—he reminded me that the word "kudos" is singular, not plural, which I did not know for all of my years here. Mr. President, I see by your reaction, you did not know either. It is a kudos. So let me give a kudos to SHELDON WHITEHOUSE's leadership on this issue. One of his many positive traits is he knows grammar and all of that much better than most of us, but one of his greater traits is how he has been relentless in pushing forward on climate and on pushing corporate America to do more.

I look forward to continuing to work with him to shed light on the role that Big Money plays in undermining climate policy, and I look forward to hearing from the chamber of commerce on what they have to say about the ad-

ministration's latest attacks on climate science.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Schenker, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. BLACKBURN pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 233 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in the series be 10 minutes in length—I say again, 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VOTE ON SCHENKER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Schenker nomination?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH),

the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Ex.]

#### YEAS—83

Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blumenthal	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Jones	Scott (FL)
Casey	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	King	Shahen
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Coons	Leahy	Sinema
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	McConnell	Thune
Cramer	McSally	Tillis
Crapo	Menendez	Toomey
Cruz	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

#### NAYS—11

Baldwin	Hirono	Smith
Booker	Kaine	Stabenow
Brown	Klobuchar	Udall
Harris	Markey	

#### NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Moran	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tarbert nomination?

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “yea,” the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted “yea,” and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH),

the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Ex.]

#### YEAS—84

Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Cantwell	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Jones	Shahen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	Kennedy	Sinema
Cassidy	King	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Enzi	Murray	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Wyden
Fischer	Peters	Young

#### NAYS—9

Blumenthal	Hirono	Merkley
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Harris	Markey	Schumer

#### NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Gillibrand	Warren
Cruz	Moran	
Duckworth	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2024.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tarbert nomination?

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “yea” and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs.

GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or to change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Ex.]

#### YEAS—85

Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shahen
Cardin	Jones	Shelby
Carper	Kaine	Sinema
Casey	Kennedy	Smith
Cassidy	King	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young
Feinstein	Peters	
Fischer	Portman	

#### NAYS—9

Blumenthal	Hirono	Merkley
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Harris	Markey	Schumer

#### NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Moran	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is consider made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, David Perdue, John Thune, Tom Cotton, Rick Scott, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination

of Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea", the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) would have voted "yea", and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Ex.]

#### YEAS—56

Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeben	Roberts
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Cantwell	Isakson	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	King	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sinema
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Young
Gardner	Paul	

#### NAYS—37

Baldwin	Hassan	Schatz
Bennet	Heinrich	Shumer
Blumenthal	Hirono	Shaheen
Booker	Kaine	Smith
Brown	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Harris	Rosen	

#### NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Gillibrand	Warren
Cassidy	Moran	
Duckworth	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### TARIFFS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since President Trump announced his intent to impose tariffs on goods imported to the United States from Mexico, I have been perplexed at the reaction from our Democratic colleagues on both sides of the Capitol. They seem to have washed their hands of the humanitarian crisis occurring at the border.

Again, these are President Obama's words. In 2014 he identified this crush of humanity coming across from Central America into the United States claiming asylum as a humanitarian and security crisis. But our Democratic friends are simply washing their hands of any responsibility and have not offered any solutions or any ideas on how to solve the problem.

Perhaps they feel like this is President Trump's problem, but this is more than just the President's problem. It is America's problem and challenge: How do we deal with this flood of humanity?

I would like to be clear on one point. I agree with the President that Mexico needs to do more to staunch the flow of people across its borders and into the United States. They must do more and we must do more to stop this mass migration, but any action must prioritize both our country's physical and our economic security.

Tariffs are not my first choice on how to address this problem. In fact, that is not the most responsible way to address this. The most responsible way to address it is by taking up, debating, and voting on bipartisan legislation that would actually fix the vulnerabilities in our current law that are being exploited by the human smugglers who are charging between \$5,000 and \$10,000 per person to smuggle people from Central America, across Mexico, and into the United States.

Tariffs, on the other hand, would be a massive tax. The U.S. Chamber estimates that Texas alone would face \$5.35 billion in increased costs as a result of a 5-percent tariff that could take effect as early as Monday. This translates into about \$1,000 more on a car.

I am happy that the Vice President and Secretary Pompeo are meeting with the Mexican Foreign Minister and other officials today. Actually, I am encouraged by the response of the Mexican Government, and I can only hope that they come up with some sort of agreement so that these tariffs do not go into effect.

Stronger action by Mexico would be a step in the right direction, but it doesn't come close to solving the underlying problem. I feel like a broken record at times, constantly reminding my colleagues here of the challenges we are facing in Texas because of this crisis.

More than 100,000 people illegally crossed our southern border between March and April—100,000. That is not a combined figure. It is about 100,000 each month. The Department of Home-

land Security has not released statistics for the month of May, but I am not expecting any good news.

As a matter of fact, if nothing changes, the pull factors—the reasons why people would leave their homes in Central America, cross Mexico, and make this dangerous trip into the United States—are doing nothing but getting worse, encouraging more and more people to take that dangerous trip.

Unlike in previous years, the vast majority of those crossing aren't from Mexico, as I said. So far this fiscal year, 74 percent of the Border Patrol's apprehensions across the southern border were people coming from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador.

And if you talk to the McAllen Sector Border Patrol chief, he will tell you that last year alone people from 140 different countries—140 different countries—came across our southern border with Mexico and into the United States. That is because they realize, if you can fly or get any way you can—take a boat, swim, get to Central America—you can make your way up from Central America into the United States. The individuals illegally entering our country are overwhelmingly either families or unaccompanied children, which means we don't have the facilities, the resources, or legal authorities. We need to expeditiously process them and care for them properly.

What is more, 70 percent of unaccompanied children and family unit apprehensions are occurring in just two sectors—El Paso and the Rio Grande Valley—making the State of Texas and its border communities the hardest hit.

We are ground zero for this crisis. As I said, this is equated to an all-out humanitarian crisis along the border. Our law enforcement officials, city leaders, nongovernmental organizations—everyone who wants to treat these migrants compassionately and appropriately is being completely overwhelmed by the massive waves of people who are entering our country.

We need to get to work on both short-term and long-term solutions.

First, we need to get additional funding to the departments and agencies that are trying to manage this crisis and care for the migrants in their custody. Without action here in Congress, funding could dry up by the end of this month, creating an even more dire situation. That should be our most immediate focus—getting funding to the agencies responsible for managing this crisis. I know the appropriators are working on this, and I hope we can come up with a solution soon because time is not on our side. But that is not a fix; that is a patch.

Any sort of lasting change cannot be solved by a funding bill or by tariffs. It has to be solved by something only Congress can do—passing legislation that addresses the root of the problem.

From what I know, there is only one bill that would address this humanitarian crisis at the border, a bill that



already has Republican and Democratic support. That is a bill I introduced called the HUMANE Act.

I have learned a lot when it comes to legislating on immigration issues. A lot of folks are more interested in talking about it than they are interested in finding a solution. But that wasn't the case when I picked up the phone and called my friend HENRY CUELLAR, a Democrat from Laredo, TX. Obviously, I am a Republican. HENRY is a Democrat in the House. But he understands this situation better than most, and he has been my consistent ally in working on a number of ways to bring common-sense reform to these issues.

We don't always agree on everything, but we do agree on some things, and where we do agree, we work together to try to provide effective solutions. As I mentioned, we introduced the HUMANE Act last month, which will make targeted, long-overdue reforms to our immigration system. Importantly, it includes provisions that both Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree on. First, it closes a major loophole that is often exploited by families and the human smugglers who move them across the border illegally. This is the Flores settlement agreement. This is a lawsuit and a settlement.

Flawed court rulings have looked at the Flores settlement and have turned this once well-intentioned agreement into a major pull factor for migrants hoping to game the system. They know we can't detain children and family units for more than 20 days, and they are using it against us to game the system, to win, to successfully place people into the United States because we simply don't have the authorities to detain them until they can present their claims to an immigration judge.

Rather than single adults arriving at the border alone, we know that the smugglers are sending children, sometimes unaccompanied, sometimes posing as a family unit when they are not even biologically related—so much that the Department of Homeland Security has now been giving DNA testing to determine whether an adult is falsely claiming a child to be their biological offspring so that they can make their way into the country, exploiting the gaps and loopholes that I have talked about.

Children are literally being kidnapped to serve as free tickets into the United States. Tragically, they are often abused, physically or sexually, along the way, and many arrive at our border in critical health.

I have shared the concern expressed by Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle when we see children die in some of our facilities along the border, but that is not because they got sick there in the first place. They got ill on the way, coming from Central America, across Mexico, into the United States, suffering from exposure, being exposed to all sorts of infectious diseases. By the time they get into U.S. custody,

some of them simply don't survive. That is a terrible human tragedy. But the problem is not trying to create more medical facilities at the border; it should be to try to stop people from making this dangerous trek in the first place.

The HUMANE Act would stop that practice by clarifying that the Flores agreement applies only to unaccompanied children, which was the original agreement, not family units as it was subsequently interpreted by another court. It would provide more time for processing and immigration proceedings to take place before families could be released from custody.

Under the current practice, because the numbers are overwhelming the capacity of the immigration courts to hear these cases—and there is simply not enough time to get to these cases when you have to release them in 20 days—they are given a notice to appear for a future court date. Guess what. The vast majority of them simply don't show up for that court hearing, and they remain in the United States perhaps for the rest of their lives unless, perhaps, they get picked up for an unrelated crime.

Our legislation would require that all accompanied children be processed exactly the same, regardless of their country of origin.

Under current law, children from Mexico or Canada can be promptly returned home. But the process for other countries moves much more slowly and represents another vulnerability in our legal authorities. I believe we should make every effort to safely return all children to their home countries as soon as possible, regardless of what country they are from.

This bill includes other provisions to protect children who have been brought to our border, such as biometric screening to ensure that they are literally the biological offspring of the people who claim to be their parents rather than a human trafficker.

It would also place prohibitions on certain individuals who would serve as guardians. For example, no child should be released into the custody of a sex offender or human trafficker. We don't have that confidence now.

The HUMANE Act would enable families to stay together. There has been a lot of discussion about separation of children from their families. We want them to stay together. I think we all agree that should be the standard, but we also need to streamline the processing of those in custody.

Consistent with the recommendations by the bipartisan Department of Homeland Security Advisory Committee, the bill would require the Department of Homeland Security to establish at least four regional processing centers along the southern border to house and process these families. They would literally serve as a one-stop shop, with Department of Homeland Security personnel, folks from Custom and Border Protection, ICE—

Immigration and Customs Enforcement—the immigration service, and FEMA all working together to assist migrants and working to process their claims on a timely and respectful basis. Asylum officers would also be required to be onsite to adjudicate claims as soon as they could and expedite the entire process, which we hope would begin to ease the burden of our current debilitating immigration court backlog.

I believe that if we actually did this, people with legitimate claims would find their claims recognized earlier, and people with illegitimate claims would be returned to their country of origin, which is the way our laws should be enforced.

It is important to recognize that we should not only enforce our immigration laws; as long as they are on the books, we ought to use the time-honored principle of deterrence. In other words, if people realize they are paying good money to try to make their way into the United States in the hands of a human smuggler but because of the way we have corrected and reformed our laws, it is no longer possible to exploit the vulnerabilities of the system, fewer and fewer of them will actually start that trek—that dangerous trek from their home in Central America.

So deterrence is something we need to use on our side, and right now there is no deterrence because the smugglers know this is a money-making machine for them. They care nothing about the people involved. They are commodity agnostic. They will just as soon traffic someone for sex as they will move a migrant from Central America for economic reasons or move drugs from across the border into the United States. We need to deter all sorts of criminal activity like that.

In addition to these changes, the legislation also includes other provisions that I think are just commonsense improvements, like additional Customs and Border Protection personnel and training for CBP and ICE employees who work with children.

There is one last point on what is happening at the border and its impact on the economy and trade. In Laredo, TX alone—I think it just surpassed Los Angeles as the largest port of entry into the United States—there are between 14,000 and 16,000 trucks a day that traverse the U.S.-Mexico border between Nuevo Laredo and Laredo. A lot of that is a part of the manufacturing process, which happens on both sides of the border. But when these trucks can't make their way across the border on a timely basis, then that means the parts or the manufacturing processes fall apart—and the border economies.

I would argue the larger economy in the United States is threatened when just-in-time inventory control no longer works. If you are living in Detroit, MI, and you are expecting that the delivery of a part coming from Mexico will make its way to Michigan



in time to build a car, you can't do it. Eventually, this is going to damage our economy and kill jobs.

So I would like to reiterate, in conclusion, that the HUMANE Act is bipartisan; it is bicameral; and it would provide real relief for folks in Texas and other border states who are struggling to manage the crisis. Most importantly, it would be a much more humane way to treat these children and families who are flooding across our southern border.

I know most of our congressional Democratic friends have adopted the posture of reflexively standing against the President on anything and everything he asks for rather than standing for policies that would actually become the law and make the situation better.

I think this is a much better solution than tariffs on Mexican goods brought into the United States.

The President's team is negotiating the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the USMCA, and I am hopeful we can get that passed here in the Congress once it is sent over from the administration. But I worry that not only are these tariffs that are potentially being placed on goods brought in the United States going to hurt our booming economy and jobs here, they also are going to jeopardize the passage of the USMCA—the successor to NAFTA, which I think we should all acknowledge is a big, positive development for the administration. Why would we jeopardize the passage of the USMCA? Why would we hurt our economy while trying to punish Mexico for not doing more—which they should do to stop the illegal passage of people across their country when there is a reasonable and responsible alternative.

I urge all of my colleagues to take a serious look at the HUMANE Act so we can finally do our part, which only we in Congress can do to stem the flow of Central American migrants who are flooding our borders and to prevent criminals and human smugglers from infiltrating our country as they are doing now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DETER ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues for supporting the Defending Elections against Trolls from Enemy Regimes Act, aka the DETER Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation I introduced with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and Senator GRASSLEY.

This legislation would prevent foreign regimes from exploiting U.S. immigration laws to undermine U.S. elec-

tions. Specifically, it would make “improper interference in U.S. elections” a violation of immigration law.

Given the ongoing threat to the United States in terms of the integrity of our electoral process from Russian interference, we need to ensure that we are denying—and, if necessary, revoking—any visas to foreign nationals who seek to improperly interfere in our elections.

One of the most important takeaways from the Mueller report is that Russia successfully attacked America in 2016 by doing everything it could to undermine our election process.

Page 1 of the Mueller report says: “The Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion.”

The report detailed numerous examples of Russian interference, including an “intelligence-gathering mission” that employees of the Internet Research Agency—also known as the IRA—took in June of 2014. The IRA was the Russian troll farm that waged information warfare against the 2016 election with stolen identities, fake social media accounts, fake campaign events, and even attacking the voter list for the State of Illinois.

The report and the earlier indictment of several IRA employees noted that two of the Russians arrived in the United States for a 3-week trip “for the purpose of collecting intelligence to inform [IRA’s] operations.”

The DETER Act would respond to threats like this, barring foreign actors from traveling to our country to interfere in our elections. I thank my colleagues for supporting this important legislation which was approved on Monday night. I hope the U.S. House of Representatives will quickly pass it and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

This should be the first of many steps Congress takes to deter and punish future election interference by the Russians or by any foreign power.

#### IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, as a Presidential candidate, Donald Trump campaigned on a promise to the American people that he would “get tough” on immigrants and secure our border. We heard it loud and clear, didn't we. The wall was to be built by the Mexicans, accusing Mexicans coming into this country of being murderers and rapists. We heard it over and over and over again.

Now, more than 2 years into the Trump administration, it is clear that the President has failed in his efforts on immigration—especially when it comes to families and children. It is obvious our southern border today is much less secure than it was when Donald Trump took office.

Take a look at these numbers. They tell the story, a dramatic story. In fiscal year 2017, which was the end of the Obama administration and the beginning of the Trump administration, in 12 months, 303,000 people were appre-

hended at our border, including 75,000 families and 41,000 unaccompanied children. Now, 2 years later, the numbers are dramatically higher under President Trump's watch. Only 6 months into this fiscal year 2019, 361,000 people have already been apprehended at the border. It was 303,000 over a 12-month period 2 years ago, when the President took office; now, 361,000 in 6 months, including 189,000 families and 36,000 unaccompanied children. That is more total apprehensions in the first half of this year, in the first 6 months, than all 12 months of 2017.

The Department of Homeland Security has been engulfed in Trumpian chaos. In less than 2½ years of the Trump administration, there have already been four heads of the Department of Homeland Security—four—in 2½ years: Secretary John Kelly, Acting Secretary Elaine Duke, Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen, and now Acting Secretary Kevin McAleenan. Within the Department of Homeland Security, there have already been, under this administration, in a little over 2 years, four Acting Directors of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and three nominees to head this agency.

Under President Trump, ICE has never had a Director confirmed by this Republican-controlled Senate, which spends all of its time approving nominees. The Trump administration has never had a Director of ICE confirmed because the proposed nominees' names keep changing. In fact, every major position at the Department of Homeland Security is now held by a temporary appointee not confirmed by the Senate—not confirmed by the Republican-controlled Senate.

A major front in President Trump's war on immigrants has been his attack on Dreamers. Dreamers are young immigrants who came to the United States as infants, toddlers, and children. They have gone to school with our kids. They have given back to their communities as teachers, nurses, engineers, and even soldiers. They are American in every way except for their official immigration status.

In 2010, I joined with the late Republican Senator Dick Lugar of Indiana, on a bipartisan basis, calling on President Obama to use his legal authority to try to protect these Dreamers from deportation. President Obama responded by creating the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA.

DACA provided a temporary 2-year legal status to Dreamers if they stepped forward, paid a filing fee, went through a criminal background check, registered with the government, and had nothing in their background that would disqualify them from staying in the United States.

More than 800,000 of these young people came forward. They received DACA protection. DACA has really given them their first chance, on a 2-year renewable basis, to not be afraid of deportation and to be able to legally

work and go to school in the United States. They used that opportunity well. They became soldiers of the United States, engineers, teachers, small business owners, and medical professionals, but on September 5, 2017, President Donald Trump repealed this program. Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers faced losing their work permits and being deported to countries they barely knew.

President Trump also terminated the temporary protected status program—known as TPS—for more than 300,000 immigrants. TPS allows nationals of another country who were in the United States to stay here legally if it is too dangerous to return to their country. The termination of this program by President Trump jeopardizes the safety of these immigrants, and many of them with American children, who number in the thousands.

When he announced the repeal of DACA, President Trump called on Congress to “legalize DACA,” but then he turned around and rejected numerous bipartisan proposals to protect the Dreamers.

Last year, I worked with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, the Republican chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to craft a bipartisan agreement that included the Dream Act and path to citizenship for TPS holders. However, President Trump profanely rejected my legislation in a tense meeting in the Oval Office.

Instead, the President tried to put the entire hard-line immigration agenda on the backs of the Dreamers. He said he would only support legalization for these young people if Congress passed his plan—his complete plan—which would, among other things, slash legal immigration by more than 40 percent.

There is a lot of debate in this country about immigration, for sure, but we usually agree on a couple basics: First, we are a nation of immigrants. Second, many immigrants come to this country and work extremely hard for their families, for their future, creating businesses and opportunities at great personal sacrifice. The notion by some that we would cut back on legal immigration to this country at a time when we desperately need increases in our workforce is so shortsighted.

This plan to slash legal immigration by more than 40 percent by President Trump was rejected by the bipartisan Senate. It would have been the largest cut in legal immigration in almost a century. The President would have taken our Nation back to one of the darkest chapters, when we were closing immigration to certain groups across the board, discriminating against them in terms that are largely unacceptable to America today. Thank goodness, the Senate rejected this plan by a bipartisan supermajority.

Yesterday was quite a day here on Capitol Hill. The legislative achievement of the U.S. Senate yesterday: a unanimous consent request to strike a

coin to commemorate women’s suffrage. I was happy to support that, but that is what we did yesterday.

What happened across the Rotunda in the House of Representatives? Yesterday the House of Representatives responded to President Trump’s cruel decision on DACA and TPS. The House passed the American Dream and Promise Act on a bipartisan vote of 237 to 187.

I went over to stand on the floor of the House, where I served for a number of years, just to hear the debate and to thank my colleagues for their leadership. I want to call out especially the statements that were made and the support given by Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader STENY HOYER, Judiciary Committee Chairman JERRY NADLER, Immigration Subcommittee Chair ZOE LOFGREN, and the lead sponsors of the bill Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, and my friend and fellow Illinoisan Congressman CHUY GARCÍA.

This vote was especially important to me because this legislation that they passed yesterday in the House of Representatives includes the Dream Act. It was 19 years ago that I introduced the first DREAM Act, bipartisan legislation that would give Dreamers a chance to earn their way to legal status and citizenship.

Now the eyes of hundreds of thousands of Dreamers have moved across the Capitol and are focused on the Senate. They are counting on us to solve the DACA crisis that President Trump has created. Will Majority Leader Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky give them a chance? I certainly hope so. The Senate should send the American Dream and Promise Act to the President’s desk for his signature.

The Senate also has a responsibility to address the humanitarian crisis at our southern border, a crisis which this administration has made much, much worse.

When this President threatens to shut down the border, which he has on many occasions, it is like a neon sign to the smugglers to use this threat to encourage more desperate families to flee toward our border.

When the President says he is going to block all assistance to the Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras and shut down any avenues for legal migration, he just guarantees that more refugees in desperation will head to our borders.

Earlier this year, the President forced the longest government shutdown in the history of the United States, 35 days—35 days, when men and women who serve in our government in important jobs like air traffic control at our airports were denied their pay. Why would the President do this to these men and women and to others, thousands of others, in our Federal workforce? It was his desperate pursuit of his beloved border wall so he could

fulfill a campaign promise that he told us over and over and over again would be paid for by Mexico.

The Trump government shutdown paralyzed our immigration courts. For 35 days, they saw their backlogs increase. The backlog has already grown by close to 300,000 cases pending before those courts in the last two years. These courts play a critical role in processing cases of immigrants seeking asylum at our border.

Within the last week, the President has said he will impose tariffs on all goods coming into the United States from Mexico, which will raise prices on American consumers, kill jobs in America, and once again put the burden—the political burden—on farmers in the United States, including in Illinois.

The administration and its Republican allies in Congress argue that critical humanitarian protections for families and children are the real problem here. They claim with a straight face that we can better protect these migrants by making it easier to detain them indefinitely and deport them without any due process. But if people were migrating to the United States because of the so-called legal loopholes, which the administration keeps talking about, they would be coming from all over the region. They are not. The vast majority of families and children are not coming from Mexico but from the three countries in the Northern Triangle, as I mentioned earlier.

In April, I visited the port of entry in El Paso, TX, and a nearby Border Patrol station. What I saw in those overcrowded facilities was heartbreaking. There are detention cells where these migrants are being held. Over the door of one of these cells, which has a window that you can look into, it says: “Capacity: 35.” I counted close to 150 men standing shoulder to shoulder in that detention cell. They are served their meals, and they eat them standing up. There is room for maybe 20 or 30 to sit on benches. The rest stand all day and take turns at night lying on the floor. There is not room for them. I have since been told that this cell has increased its numbers from 150 to 200.

Next door to that cell was a sign outside of the door that read “Capacity: 16.” Inside that cell, I counted about 75 women, including nursing mothers with their babies. I have been told that this number has since dramatically increased as well.

How long will they be in these cells? I am told anywhere from 3 days to 6 weeks. As I said, one of the women cells had a capacity of 16. I looked in there, and it was painful to catch the eyes of those who are being held there, and they mouthed the word “Help.”

It has reached a point where over 20 Senators have joined me in writing to the International Red Cross, which inspects prison facilities around the world. We asked them to inspect our detention facilities on America’s border. It was a sad day to make the request, but it had to be made.

I also asked the DHS Acting Inspector General to investigate these Border Patrol facilities. Last week, the Inspector General's Office at DHS released a report detailing the inhumane and dangerous overflow of migrants at the El Paso port of entry. The Inspector General's Office found that overcrowding was "an immediate risk to the health and safety of detainees and DHS employees."

While we fail to even debate this issue here in Washington, we cannot overlook the inhumane conduct that is occurring at the border. We are better than that.

This notion of zero tolerance, where we separated 2,880 infants and toddlers from their parents, some of whom it took months to bring back together—to me, that does not speak well of who we are as a nation.

Look at this picture that was taken by the IG at one of the cells. Their faces are blanked out, but it gives an idea of the mass of humanity I counted—the IG found 76 women were in a cell for 12 people.

The Inspector General's report said that the Department of Homeland Security has been aware of the situation in El Paso for months but has not identified a process to alleviate overcrowding. Meanwhile, weeks ago, months ago, Congress passed an emergency appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars for humanitarian care of these people at the border. It isn't as if we haven't given the administration resources to deal with at least the immediate crisis on their hands. The IG report said that DHS has been aware of this situation for months, but they haven't taken measures to deal with it. This report called on them to take immediate steps.

The Department of Homeland Security gave a target completion date of November 30, 2020—a year and a half from now—for the completion of a centralized processing center in El Paso. The Inspector General found this response completely inadequate, and so do I.

Democrats are serious about addressing this situation. There are some bottom-line standards that I think we all should look to.

First, we need border security, there is no doubt in my mind. In an age of terrorism, with the worst drug epidemic in the history of the United States, I want to know who is crossing our border and what they are bringing. Every American should want to know.

Secondly, there is no excuse for allowing a dangerous person to come into this country. If we know they are dangerous, they are not welcome. And if they are here in any questionable status and a danger to America, they have to go.

Third—and it pains me to say this as the son of an immigrant woman, but it is a fact—we cannot absorb all of the people in the world who want to come to the United States. It is not economically or even physically possible for

that to happen. We have to have standards when it comes to immigration.

Once we have established those three standards, shouldn't we come together, Democrats and Republicans, and rewrite our immigration laws, this broken system that has led to this point? It will not be solved by threats of walls, by threats of closing the borders, by threats of cutting off foreign aid. That makes the situation even worse, and, sadly, President Trump has proven that point in the 2-plus years he has been in office.

I am serious about addressing this, deadly serious about what it means to Dreamers and people here in temporary protected status. In February, after the President finally ended his government shutdown, I helped write an omnibus appropriations bill. We put \$564 million in the bill for inspection equipment so we could scan and x ray every car and truck coming into the United States and grab the narcotics at the border before they make it to my hometown and yours. I hope we all agree on that. There was \$414 million in that bill for humanitarian assistance. I can't tell you how that is being spent.

We could do more to make sure that even in the midst of political controversy, our border is secure and our treatment of these desperate people is humane and that we will be able to answer to history for how we are conducting ourselves.

Democrats have introduced the Central America Reform and Enhancement Act as a comprehensive response to this problem.

We need to address the root causes in the Northern Triangle countries that are driving these migrants here.

We need to crack down on the cartels and traffickers who are exploiting these migrants.

We need to provide for in-country processing, which the Obama administration provided for and the Trump administration eliminated. What it meant was that residents in those three countries did not have to make a dangerous and expensive trip across Mexico to our border to find out if they were eligible for asylum; they could do it in their home country. The Obama administration had that program. The Trump administration eliminated it, and people started making that trip across Mexico to test whether they were legally eligible to stay in this country.

In that Democratic bill, we eliminate immigration court backlogs so that asylum claims could be processed more quickly.

We stand ready to work on smart, effective, and humane border security policies. But the President needs to be part of the solution. If this is about his reelection, appealing to his base, and being tougher and tougher, I could tell him: It is not working, Mr. President. It is not working for the good of this country. Perhaps your political base finds it appealing, but I think the American people are now looking for

solutions. They want us to work on a bipartisan basis. We have a chance and an opportunity.

The House of Representatives' action yesterday, I hope, is the beginning of a meaningful dialogue to deal with this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from South Dakota.

#### ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, our economy has made tremendous strides over the past 2 years. Americans on the whole have access to more jobs, higher wages, and more opportunities. Unfortunately, our Nation's agricultural economy is trailing behind the broader economy.

A combination of low commodity prices, protracted trade disputes, and natural disasters and weather-related issues have left many farmers and ranchers struggling. Nationwide, net farm income is about half of what it was in 2013—half.

In my home State of South Dakota, farmers and ranchers are currently facing the fallout from severe winter storms, heavy rainfall, bomb cyclones, and spring flooding. Less than half of this year's acreage intended for corn has been planted. Compare that to this time last year, when 96 percent of our State's corn was in the ground and growing. Today, just 14 percent of South Dakota's soybeans have been planted, compared to 83 percent this time last year. To make matters worse, for many farmers, this year's planting season is already over, as their land is completely flooded and will not dry out in time for anything to be planted. Other States that produce the bulk of our country's corn and soybeans are facing similar planting challenges.

There have been some recent wins for farmers and ranchers. The administration's announcement that it is lifting the ban on the year-round sale of E15—15 percent ethanol-blended fuel—is great news for corn producers in South Dakota and around the Nation. It is a big win for consumers, too, who will have access to this cleaner, lower cost fuel during the summer driving season for the first time. I have spent nearly my entire time in the Senate advocating for higher blends of ethanol, and I am pleased the Trump administration has followed through on its commitment to address this issue.

Another recent win was Japan's announcement that it was lifting age limits on U.S. beef imports, giving America's ranchers full access to the Japanese market. CNBC reports that the U.S. Meat Export Federation predicts that Japan's move could increase U.S. beef sales to Japan by \$150 million to \$200 million per year.

While these victories are important, there is a lot more work to be done to get our Nation's farmers and ranchers back on their feet. I hear regularly from South Dakota ag producers about the challenges they are facing, and I constantly share their concerns with

the administration, whether I am meeting with the President or other officials.

One of the biggest things we can do for our Nation's farmers and ranchers is secure trade deals that will open new markets for American agricultural products.

I support the President's efforts to secure more favorable treatment for American products and his determination to ensure that China honors the trade commitments it has made, but I believe we need to wrap up negotiations on these various agreements we are discussing as quickly as possible. Along with increased market access, farmers and ranchers need certainty about what international markets are going to look like.

I am committed to doing everything I can to advance trade agreements with Japan and with the European Union. I am also doing everything I can to move the United States-Mexico-Canada free-trade agreement through Congress in the near future. This agreement would benefit American agriculture, create jobs, and grow our economy, and we should pass it as soon as possible. We should be wary of any action that might jeopardize this trade agreement and the markets it will open for our producers.

Another issue of concern to farmers and ranchers is the implementation of the 2018 farm bill. Getting a pro-agriculture, pro-farmer bill to the President was one of my top priorities last year, and I am proud of the bill we delivered.

I took ideas and suggestions from South Dakota farmers and ranchers and developed more than 40 proposals aimed at making life better for American agricultural producers. Nearly 20 of my proposals were included in the final bill, including my new short-term, soil-building conservation program for farmers who don't want to tie up ground for 10 years or more in the Conservation Reserve Program.

Now that the farm bill is law, we have to make sure that it is implemented in a timely manner and as Congress intended. I have spent years pushing for an increase in the Conservation Reserve Program's acreage cap, and we finally got a substantial increase in last year's bill.

The Department of Agriculture needs to expedite both general and continual CRP signups to allow farmers to take full advantage of that cap increase. I have been strongly urging the Department to make sure that farmers can sign up in a timely manner. Taking millions of acres of environmentally sensitive land out of crop production in the next year could have a big impact on the farm economy by driving up commodity prices and increasing farmers' profits, but in order for this to happen, we need to make sure that farmers can get their least productive land enrolled in the CRP program and out of crop production by next year.

South Dakota farmers and ranchers are the lifeblood of our State, and I am

committed to doing everything I can to address their needs here in Washington. In addition to working on trade issues and farm bill implementation, I am working with the Department of Agriculture's Risk Management Agency to ensure that our farmers are treated fairly under crop insurance prevent plant and cover crop rules.

I have been working with the Agriculture Department to make certain the recently announced second round of Market Facilitation Program payments do not affect this year's planting decisions. I have also requested that this second round of MFP payments provide equitable assistance to all producers, especially those with failed and damaged crops or who were prevented from planting this year's crops due to adverse weather.

And, as I said, I will continue to push for trade agreements with China and other countries so that our Nation's farmers receive a check from the sale of their products overseas instead of from the Department of Agriculture.

I also recently led a letter to the President in support of Governor Noem's request for a major disaster declaration in South Dakota, and 2 weeks ago I voted in favor of the Additional Supplemental Appropriations Act, which would provide additional disaster funding for States and Territories harmed by last year's hurricanes and wildfires and this year's flooding. The bill also includes \$3 billion to provide assistance for farmers' crop losses from the 2018 and 2019 natural disasters.

Our Nation's farmers and ranchers have a tough, backbreaking job. Instead of air-conditioned and heated offices, they labor in the hot Sun, the cold rain, and the snow. They start their days before the Sun rises and often end them long after the Sun falls. Most Americans never think about the blood, sweat, and tears that have gone into that loaf of bread or that gallon of milk that they grab off the grocery store shelf, but we are all the beneficiaries of the hard work and the dedication of our Nation's farmers and ranchers. It is an honor to represent so many of these hard-working people here in the Senate.

To South Dakota's farmers and ranchers, I want to say I hear you. I know that things have been incredibly tough for you all over the past few years. I know that you are fighting through a lot of challenges, and I am committed to making sure that Washington addresses your priorities, and I will do everything that I can to make sure that you have access to the support and the resources you need to continue feeding our Nation and the world. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this weekend another community was torn apart by gun violence. Once again, politicians do what so many politicians in this body do. They offer thoughts and prayers to the people of Virginia Beach, and then they move on. It is tragic, and it is obscene how routine this has become in our country and how routine that reaction from far too many politicians—from the White House on down—has become.

This month we mark Gun Violence Awareness Month, but in our country every month, every week, and every day we endure senseless gun violence. Congress has ignored for too long the millions of Americans who want reasonable gun safety measures instead of doing the bidding of the gun lobby.

We cannot say we are doing what it takes to keep our country safe until we are finally willing to pass common-sense laws to protect all Americans from gun violence. Many of us have tried.

I supported the original Federal assault weapons ban in 1994. I joined with many of my colleagues to vote to renew it after Sandy Hook. Weapons of war and assault weapons do not belong on our streets.

We have tried to pass legislation to close loopholes in our background check system so that people who buy guns on the internet or at gun shows have to go through the same background checks as law-abiding gun owners who buy their guns at stores in Ohio.

After the tragedy at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, we tried to pass legislation to prevent people on the terrorist watch list from buying guns. If you are too dangerous to get on an airplane—if the government says you can't ride in the plane because you are on the terrorist watch list—it should be too dangerous for you to buy a deadly weapon. But this body is so, so in the pocket of the NRA that they will not even pass legislation like that. The gun lobby, again, stood in the way. We know what happened each and every time. They stood in the way, despite the fact that the laws we are talking about would not undermine the rights of law-abiding gun owners.

I respect the rights of hunters, of collectors, and of responsible law-abiding gun owners. No one is trying to take away their guns. When our students aren't safe in our schools, it is clear that something has to be done. When workers aren't safe on the job, it is clear that we have to do something. When too many Americans don't feel safe going about their daily lives in their communities, we can't sit here and do nothing.

We will not give up on making our country safer. We will keep working until we get weapons of war out of our schools, out of our workplaces, out of our neighborhoods, and out of our

places of worship. Creating change in our country isn't easy. It requires going up against powerful special interests. Few are as powerful as the NRA. Change never starts in Washington. We make progress because of grassroots movements of Americans all across our country demanding action. From Marches for Our Lives to the Women's March, to the activism around the Affordable Care Act, Americans proved again and again and again the power of activism. Mothers and fathers, students and teachers all across this country who stood up and marched for gun safety are the people we sent here to serve, not the special interest gun lobby.

I hope my colleagues will not so easily forget what happened in Virginia Beach and at the Poway synagogue and in Pittsburgh and in Parkland and in Orlando and at the Capital Gazette in Annapolis and in Las Vegas and in Sandy Hook and in our neighborhoods around this country every month, every week, and every day.

#### NOMINATION OF SUSAN COMBS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to speak in strong support of the nomination of Ms. Susan Combs, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget at the Department of the Interior.

This is one of five Assistant Secretary positions at Interior, and, as the title suggests, it is critical to the Department's ability to function. The individual who holds this position is responsible for overseeing everything from the annual budget request to financial management, procurement, and policy and program analysis.

The President's nominee, Susan Combs, is very well qualified. She has previously served as a State representative, as agriculture commissioner, and as comptroller in her home State of Texas. Over the years, Ms. Combs has worked extensively with the Department of the Interior, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which has helped her gain substantive expertise about a range of issues that she will face in her new role.

My only wish is that we could have confirmed Ms. Combs long ago. Instead, due to holds and delays here on the Senate floor, she ultimately had to be reported from the Energy and Natural Resources committee on three separate occasions—in 2017, in 2018, and again this year. She is not controversial. Each time, we reported her with bipartisan support. But she has now been forced to wait for a total of nearly 700 days for confirmation, meaning she will have held up for longer than she will be able to serve, at least in the current term.

I appreciate Ms. Combs' willingness to serve our country. I appreciate her patience over the course of nearly 2 full years, which is testament to just how broken the nominations process had become, and her commitment to see this through. I also thank Leader

McCONNELL for scheduling this vote and encourage every Member of this Chamber to vote in favor of confirmation.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Combs nomination?

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or to change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Ex.]

#### YEAS—57

Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blackburn	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cantwell	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Isakson	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	King	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sinema
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Young

#### NAYS—36

Baldwin	Harris	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Markey	Warren
Booker	Moran	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Joni Ernst, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, John Kennedy, John Boozman, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Lindsey Graham, Rick Scott.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 142 Ex.]

## YEAS—60

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Braun	Grassley	Roberts
Brown	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Carper	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Coons	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sinema
Cotton	King	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Durbin	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young

## NAYS—33

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Udall
Duckworth	Murphy	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Murray	Warner
Harris	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Reed	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Markey	Warren
Booker	Moran	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

## CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rossie David Alston, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, David Perdue, John Thune, Tom Cotton, Rick Scott, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Rossie David Alston, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEX-

ANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Ex.]

## YEAS—74

Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Casey	Jones	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sinema
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Leahy	Tester
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Portman	

## NAYS—19

Baldwin	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Wyden
Duckworth	Murray	
Harris	Peters	

## NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Markey	Warren
Booker	Moran	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 19.

The motion is agreed to.

## CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Richard A. Hertling, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, David Perdue, John Thune, Tom Cotton, Rick Scott, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Richard A. Hertling, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea", the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea", and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Ex.]

## YEAS—66

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murphy
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Braun	Hawley	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Hoeven	Romney
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Carper	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Coons	Kaine	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sinema
Cotton	King	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	McSally	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

## NAYS—23

Bennet	Hassan	Schumer
Blumenthal	Hirono	Shaheen
Brown	Menendez	Smith
Cantwell	Merkley	Stabenow
Casey	Murray	Udall
Cortez Masto	Peters	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Rosen	Wyden
Harris	Schatz	

## NOT VOTING—11

Alexander	Klobuchar	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Toomey
Gillibrand	Moran	Warren
Inhofe	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 23.

The motion is agreed to.



## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard A. Hertling, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, it be in order to proceed to file cloture on executive nominations during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Sarah Daggett Morrison, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Sarah Daggett Morrison, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Joni Ernst, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, John Kennedy, John Boozman, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Lindsey Graham, Johnny Isakson.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Pamela A. Barker, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Pamela A. Barker, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Joni Ernst, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, John Kennedy, John Boozman, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Lindsey Graham, Johnny Isakson.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Corey Landon Maze, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Corey Landon Maze, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham, John Thune, Mike Crapo.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Rodney Smith, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rodney Smith, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Bill Cassidy, David Perdue, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Braun, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Kevin Cramer, James E. Risch.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 46.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Thomas P. Barber, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Thomas P. Barber, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Bill Cassidy, David Perdue, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Mike Braun, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Kevin Cramer, James E. Risch, Pat Roberts.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Jean-Paul Boulee, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jean-Paul Boulee, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr,

John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, Ben Sasse, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Michael B. Enzi, John Kennedy, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Lindsey Graham.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 193.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of David Stilwell, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Stilwell, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Mike Crapo, John Hoeven, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, David Perdue, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Edward F. Crawford,

of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Edward F. Crawford, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, James E. Risch, Bill Cassidy, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Kevin Cramer, Mike Braun, Pat Roberts.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

#### 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about what we will be talking about around the country and around the world tomorrow. Tomorrow is the 75th anniversary of D-Day. There aren't a lot of days known in history around the world by just one letter, but June 6, 1944, is known that way. It is the greatest amphibious battlefield landing ever and probably the single greatest military operation in history. It was done to liberate people in Europe from one of the most savage regimes that ever existed.

At 15 minutes past midnight, 18,000 paratroopers began to step out of their planes high above Normandy, France, going in behind what would be the landing the next day. Below them, there were about 200,000 people streaming toward the Continent on almost 7,000 ships, with about 1 million others to follow after that landing was made on D-Day.

A journalist who wrote about the battle noted that by 4:30 that morning, the Stars and Stripes flew for the first time over a town liberated by Americans in France in World War II.

So a lot happened from midnight to 4:30, but a lot more was going to happen that day. Americans led the operation, but there were also troops from Britain, from Poland, from Norway, from Canada, and even French troops returning to help free their own country were there. They were told that when you land in Normandy, you will have only one friend: God. I am sure there was lots of praying going on that day.

It became known in literature and on film as "The Longest Day," and it gave the Allies the threshold they needed to free the Continent from the crush of the Third Reich. There was clearly chaos—that many people doing that many things in that many different ways. There were missteps, and there was bad luck, but in the end, there was an unimaginable amount of courage and sacrifice and just simple providence in what happened that day.

When one landing group was landed in the wrong place, a place they weren't supposed to land, the commanding general, Theodore Roosevelt, who was the son of the former President Theodore Roosevelt, told one of his officers just to keep on bringing the men ashore. He said: "We are going to start the war from right here." It is not where they intended to be, but it is where they were, and in their view and General Roosevelt's view that day, where we are is where we are going to start; there is no going back now. They didn't go back.

One of the men who joined the fight that day—and there were millions who would eventually—with hundreds of thousands that day was Ralph Goldsticker from the Marine Corps Reserve.

He had signed up for the Army Aviation Cadet Corps right after Pearl Harbor. He said, when talking about this later, that his parents were scared silly when they found out he had signed up immediately to become a flyer in what would become World War II.

He flew 35 missions as a bombardier flying in a B-17 Flying Fortress, including two missions on D-Day. His first mission that day was to help take out the big German guns that guarded the beach where British troops were landing. He remembers the skies being so thick with airplanes that he had to fly from southern England all the way back to Scotland just to get in line to head to France.

Later that afternoon, he flew a second mission to attack German reinforcements who were headed to the beaches. Ralph was awarded the French Legion of Honor medal in recognition of his service.

You know, he was just one of thousands of Missourians from the lowest private to General Omar Bradley, who was commanding the American troops who were part of that mission, and many of them would never return.

We just had a series of votes a little earlier than we would normally have in the week because 17 or so of our colleagues are going to be part of the D-Day celebration on this 75th anniversary. I had an opportunity myself to be in Normandy a few years ago. We were in Normandy at the Normandy American Cemetery, where there were 7,000 graves out in front of us.

On what was a private trip, not a government trip, we were fortunate to have a good guide who understood the war and the cemetery. He took us through the cemetery, and then he

took us over and sat us down on the stone wall with the English Channel to our backs and those 7,000 graves out in front of us. As we sat there at that spot, he flipped open his computer and on his computer he had some video of General Eisenhower and Walter Cronkite sitting exactly on that same spot on June 6, 1964, the 20th anniversary of D-Day.

General Eisenhower, of course, gave the orders in spite of weather and other things, hoping it would work out as it was supposed to. As for what happened on D-Day and what happened later, he said to Walter Cronkite something like this: You know, Walter, my son John graduated from West Point on D-Day. Many times over the last 20 years I thought about him and his wife and the family they have and the opportunities they have had, and I thought about these young men—Eisenhower said, looking at those graves—and I thought about these young men and what they didn't get to do because of what they were asked to do.

That, by the way, was the same commanding general who had that famous note in his wallet that day, stating that he would take full responsibility for what happened if it didn't go well. That was the kind of leader he was.

I mentioned that there were 18,000 paratroopers. He was told that 70 percent of those paratroopers would not survive the day. There is a statue here in the Rotunda of this building that is based on a photo of Eisenhower the day before D-Day, surrounded by those young paratroopers. They were 18, 19, and 20, and maybe even a few younger than 18 surrounding him. They had been told that he wouldn't want to talk to them, but when he got there, it was obvious that he was there to see them. That statue in the Rotunda shows Eisenhower making a gesture. Nobody knew for years what that particular hand gesture was, but it turns out that he was talking to a young man from Idaho, and he was talking about fly fishing. So that gesture of Eisenhower in this building, if you are in this building looking at that statue, is Eisenhower the day before D-Day, talking to a young man about fly fishing. Again, he had been told that 70 percent of those paratroopers would not survive the day because of what he and others were asking them to do.

The numbers weren't that bad, but they turned out to be plenty bad. The Germans had released water in an area behind Normandy in an unexpected way. So many of those paratroopers who expected to land on the ground instead went into flooded lands and drowned. Other things happened that couldn't have been planned for and weren't planned for, but they were there to do that job.

The fighting that first day, D-Day, paved the way for more men to come ashore. It began the long push from France into Germany and, for them, into history. I think there will be slightly more than a dozen D-Day sur-

vivors at that 75th anniversary. You don't have to do the math very long to know that if you were in the military on D-Day, you would be in your nineties today, and they are going to be there with our colleagues and others celebrating what they did and what they were willing to do.

One observer wrote on D-Day: There never had been a dawn like this one—700 ships, 200,000 people ready to land and establish the beginning of the end of World War II. So on D-Day, we remember again the sacrifice of those thousands of soldiers, sailors, and airmen. We honor their courage and devotion to the cause of liberty. We serve them by continuing to remain strong and preparing to fight for freedom everywhere. That means doing all we can for the men and women who defend us today. It means we carry the legacy of the generations that fought 75 years ago on D-Day and every other war where Americans fought and died.

They deserve our gratitude today and every day. We need to continue to understand the importance of our alliances and our willingness to stand for freedom. D-Day is a great day and this is a great, great week to be reminded of that.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the remembrances of D-Day from Senator BLUNT, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri.

It is always memorable attending D-Day events. The first one I went to—and you just spoke of the distinguished Kansan, Dwight Eisenhower—was with Robert Dole for the 40th anniversary. President Reagan asked the two of us to represent him in Italy when we first landed, while President Reagan went to Normandy. Subsequently, I went with a delegation with President Clinton and then with President George W. Bush, and, lastly, with President Obama. I found the experience overwhelming each time.

Last year—it was actually on my birthday—DICK SHELBY and I were there and laid a wreath in Normandy. Nobody can walk by there—first, seeing all the graves and realizing that they are only some of the remains—and then walking to the cliffs and looking down, and not wonder how anybody could have had the courage to face such withering fire. For some who survived, it seemed like the enemy was using a paint brush and just wiping people out. You would see them falling all around.

A well-respected doctor from our home town in Montpelier had never talked about it. On the 50th anniversary we asked him if he would join us there. He is not a wealthy man. He treated a lot of the poor Italian immigrants for nothing. My mother was a first generation Italian American, and she always talked with him. She and my father and others raised money for him to go, and after that for the first time he could talk about it.

He came back and talked about it. He was a medic and a little guy. He went off the boat with all of his gear and just sank. He would have drowned, but somebody pulled him up and brought him to the shore. He turned to say thank you, and the man who rescued him was shot dead.

He refused to leave the beach. He just treated one person after another, and his story is not unusual. So many did that. So I thank my friend from Missouri for what he said.

#### CUBA SANCTIONS

Mr. President, there are foreign policies that are thoughtful, that reflect lessons learned from history, and that advance our national interests. Let me talk about others.

I have been here for a lot of years. I was fortunate to come here at the time of President Ford and have known and seen every President since. I have seen some dumb policies by administrations over the years, both by Republicans and Democrats. I want to speak briefly about one of them because it is not just dumb. It is an embarrassment. It is going to hurt a lot of Americans. It is going to hurt a lot of good people in Cuba, and there is no denying that.

I refer to the decision announced by the Treasury Department yesterday to severely restrict travel by Americans to Cuba. Why? Because Cuba supports Nicolas Maduro.

The administration has reinstituted the failed policy of the Cold War restrictions on the right of every American citizen to travel to Cuba, even though the overwhelming majority of Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, opposes such restrictions. It means cruise ships will stop sailing there. Educational and cultural exchanges will shut down. Sports teams will stay home. School trips will end. Trade missions will end. American farmers who could export products to Cuba are going to be shut out as well as other American companies.

I have to ask: What kind of government thinks it has a right to tell its citizens where they can travel and where they can spend their own money? Ironically, not the Cuban Government, despite its repressive policies. Cubans can travel to the United States if we grant them a visa.

Russia is kleptocracy with nuclear weapons pointed at us, that invades its neighbors, supports President Assad and Nicolas Maduro, interferes with our elections, and opposes the United States at every turn in the U.N. Security Council. But Americans can travel to Russia without restriction, just as Russians can travel here.

Iran has brutally repressive government, but it does not have laws and regulations to prevent its citizens from traveling to the United States or Americans from traveling there.

Nicaragua is led by a corrupt dictator, but Nicaraguans can travel to any country that will accept them, and Americans are free to travel there.

In fact, Americans can travel anywhere in the world without restriction,

except to North Korea and now Cuba, whose people could not be more welcoming of Americans.

How do I know this? Because unlike the people in the White House and the Treasury Department who have never ever been to Cuba, I have been there. My wife Marcelle has been there. Our granddaughter Sophia has been there.

This administration's policy is being guided by a couple of hard-liners in the National Security Council who have never set foot in Cuba but are on a crusade to pressure the Cuban Government to change its policies. After 50 years of trying and failing to get Cuba to change its policies, they continue to believe that one way to do that is by preventing Americans who believe in democracy from traveling to Cuba and spending their own money there.

Of all the paternalistic, anachronistic, and hypocritical policies, that is beneath the world's oldest democracy. We tried it for 50 years, from the time I was in college. It failed. In fact, it backfired. As we blocked access to Cuba, the Cuban authorities solidified their control.

This will backfire, too. If past experience is any guide, it will cause them to intensify their support for Maduro.

We all want Maduro gone, but are we so blinded by arrogance, ideology and stupidity that we are destined to keep repeating our mistakes?

If this policy makes sense for Cuba, why not for other repressive governments whose policies we disagree with, like China? They have imprisoned a million of their Uyghur citizens. Their military is deeply involved in the economy. Yet millions of Americans go to China without restriction.

Egypt has destroyed what fragile democratic institutions existed there. They have locked up thousands of political opponents, as well as American citizens. Yet President Trump calls President al Sisi a great friend—a man who locks up Americans, locks up people who disagree with him.

Saudi Arabia commits war crimes in Yemen, they treat women as property, and they murdered Jamal Khashoggi and other dissidents. The Crown Prince, who we know was involved in the murder of Mr. Khashoggi, is apparently untouchable, and our President and Secretary of State seem to prefer it that way. But Americans can still travel to Saudi Arabia without reservation.

These regulations are an insult to every American. They are a disgrace to a free society. Since when is it the role of the Federal Government to say where Americans can travel and spend their own money, absent some threat to national security or their own health and safety, neither of which exists in Cuba?

It is not going to hurt the leaders in Cuba. They are not going to submit to bullying. If anything, it will harden their attitude toward the United States.

I know who it will hurt. It will hurt the people who most deserve our help—

the Cuban families who own small businesses, who rent out rooms in their apartments, who own their own taxis and restaurants. Artisans and musicians. People who otherwise subsist on meager government salaries and rations and benefit enormously when Americans visit Cuba.

Marcelle and I have met with many of these people—young people especially—who have Airb&Bs, who have started their own small businesses. They work extremely hard within a system stacked against them, and they need American customers. The White House just slammed the door on them.

Of course we disagree with the Cuban Government. On many things we strongly disagree. But we disagree with many governments over Venezuela and other issues. Does that give the Treasury Department the right to tell Americans they can't travel there?

What if the Treasury Department imposed such restrictions on travel by Members of Congress? What if they said "after today, Members of Congress can no longer travel to China or Russia". There is not a single Senator, Republican or Democrat, who would stand for that. What hypocrisy.

Freedom to travel is a right. It is fundamental. It is part of who we are as Americans. We travel. We explore. We meet people. We share our values. We build relationships with people we agree with and disagree with. Are we willing to stand by and let the right of private Americans to travel be trampled this way?

I will have more to say about this self-defeatist policy when I introduce the bipartisan Freedom for Americans to Travel to Cuba Act.

I urge all Senators to not let the same old, worn out, Cold War, isolationist, fearmongering, failed arguments about Cuba stand in the way of common sense.

I see one of my very good friends on the floor, the Senator from Ohio.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague and one-time President pro tempore of this body, Senator LEAHY.

#### 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about D-Day, to talk about how we would remember the 75th anniversary tomorrow of a turning point in World War II: June 6, 1944, the invasion of Normandy.

Historian Douglas Brinkley has written that D-Day was both the single most important in the 20th century and one of the bloodiest and most tragic, too, in terms of loss of life.

On D-Day, our fleets set forth from the rocky shores of Britain to reach the fog-shrouded beaches of Normandy. On board the thousands of ships and planes were our fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers—some no older than 18 years old—who would bravely venture ashore in a show of determination and duty. There were

160,000 soldiers who crossed the English Channel that day. On their backs were rucksacks, some weighing over 80 pounds. But really on their backs was the fate of our allies in Europe and, really, the fate of the free world. Were our men to fail that day, Europe might well have fallen to Hitler once and for all.

Many of our best and brightest young Americans did fall. We lost more than 10,000 men that day.

The Nazis had spent 2 years fortifying the coast to prepare for this moment. It was Hitler's so-called Atlantic Wall. The beautiful coastline of northern France was covered in barbed wire, landmines, and bunkers. Hell had come to Earth to greet our men as they landed, and still they fought on gallantly.

At the end of the largest amphibious invasion in history, we stood victorious, battered but unbroken. On we marched, through France, through Belgium, and finally into Germany. The world would never be the same.

Even today among the beautiful flowers and fields of Normandy, you can feel the lingering presence of those who died that day in service of liberating Europe, and you can see it, as I have, at the stark, orderly U.S. military cemeteries, where row after row of white crosses and Stars of David stand defiant, representing lives lost in a noble cause. Though much has happened in the following 75 years, we can never lose sight of the valor and sacrifice displayed by our Armed Forces on that day.

On Memorial Day, I spoke at the National Veterans Memorial Museum in Columbus, OH, and also at a cemetery in Grove City, OH. In both ceremonies, there were World War II veterans present and up front. To see the generations of veterans and family members there to honor the fallen was to see the living embodiment of the stories we ought to remember from a war that recedes further into the past with each passing year.

Stories of valor like that displayed by Jim "Pee Wee" Martin, from Dayton, OH. On that day, he and the rest of the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment parachuted through German lines in the dark of predawn. Jim was wounded but fought bravely, earning the Purple Heart and Bronze Star for his D-Day efforts.

Stories of sacrifice like that of the Napier Brothers of Warren County in Southwest Ohio. All five served in the war. Two of the brothers of the five landed at D-Day. One died there on the beaches, never to come home to Ohio.

These are stories to be preserved for the generations to come. The memory of D-Day and, indeed, all of World War II must never be lost. That is why I was proud to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle earlier today to show through our resolution the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the courage shown by our troops who participated in the Normandy landings that day.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have come to this floor often on D-Day to recite a very special prayer given by President Roosevelt on that fateful day. It was expected that Franklin Delano Roosevelt would give a speech when the invasion took place, as he had done many times before, called the fireside chats from the White House. But on the morning of D-Day, FDR was moved to prayer instead. That famous prayer has become known as the D-Day prayer. It is my understanding that President Trump actually recited this prayer just yesterday in the United Kingdom at an event that preceded the official ceremonies tomorrow commemorating the 75th anniversary of D-Day.

The words are powerful and deserve to be remembered for generations to come. In 2013, I introduced legislation, the World War II Memorial Act, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to install a plaque to be placed on or near the World War II Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, DC, with the words of the D-Day prayer. I like that because it adds more context and more interpretation to that beautiful World War II Memorial. It was the Ohio Christian Alliance president, Chris Long, who first came to me with this good idea of placing this plaque on or near the memorial, given its history and importance.

Since that legislation was signed into law in 2014, we have worked hard with the National Park Service, the Friends of the National World War II Memorial, and the two Federal commissions that are required to approve any permanent structure on the National Mall. It has been 5 years now—actually longer than America's involvement in World War II—and although we do not yet have this plaque placed, we have made progress.

The commissions have approved the location of the plaque to be just north of the World War II Memorial at the Circle of Remembrance. If you have been to the memorial, you come from the Washington Monument, and you see the Circle of Remembrance on the right. The commissions have also approved initial design concepts for the plaque, which must comply with the Commemorative Works Act.

We are moving forward with this project, by the way, without any Federal funding. We are relying on private fundraising, not taxpayer dollars.

We had hoped to have the plaque in place, of course, for the 75th anniversary tomorrow. I am disappointed we don't, but, instead, we will preview tomorrow the placement of a temporary plaque with the words of the prayer at the chosen location, the Circle of Remembrance, next to the World War II Memorial. At our event tomorrow—which will include the chairman of the Friends of the National World War II Memorial; officials from the National Park Service; Chris Long, president of the Ohio Christian Alliance; and a number of World War II veterans—we

will also lead a reading of the D-Day prayer. I am looking forward to that tomorrow.

The temporary plaque, by the way, was generously donated to the Friends of the National World War II Memorial by Mr. John Nau, a member of the National Parks Foundation Board, who felt strongly about at least having a temporary plaque in place.

We are hopeful that the permanent plaque will be placed at the Circle very soon.

The fact that a prayer was offered that day, on D-Day, by the Commander in Chief is historic in and of itself, but I think it is the content of the prayer that makes it so worthy of remembrance. If I may, I would now like to read the D-Day prayer.

FDR began:

My fellow Americans: Last night, when I spoke with you about the fall of Rome, I knew at that moment that troops of the United States and our allies were crossing the Channel in another and greater operation. It has come to pass with success thus far.

And so, in this poignant hour, I ask you to join with me in prayer:

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again; and we know that by Thy grace, and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.

They will be sore tried, by night and by day, without rest—until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violences of war.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and good will among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom.

And for us at home—fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters, and brothers of brave men overseas—whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them—help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help to our efforts.

Give us strength, too—strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our armed forces.

And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

And, O Lord, give us Faith. Give us Faith in Thee; Faith in our sons; Faith in each other; Faith in our united crusade. Let not

the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogancies. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister Nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men. And a peace that will let all of men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

Thy will be done, Almighty God.

Amen.

I think you will agree with me that these profound words deserve to be made a permanent part of our broader World War II Memorial for a noble day that we must never forget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UKRAINE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to spend a few moments talking about a trip I took overseas last week. After honoring our fallen soldiers here at home in Central Ohio and in Southwest Ohio, I traveled to Ukraine, where I had a meeting scheduled with Ukraine's new President, Volodymyr Zelensky. On my way there, I stopped in London for trade meetings and briefings by our Ambassador and our excellent U.S. Embassy personnel there.

I was very eager to meet President Zelensky. First of all, along with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have been a longtime supporter of Ukraine's quest for self-determination, democracy, and freedom from Russian aggression. As cochair and cofounder of the Senate Ukraine Caucus, along with my colleague DICK DURBIN of Illinois, I have been proud to take the lead since the Revolution of Dignity in 2014 in giving Ukrainians the lethal and non-lethal aid they need to defend themselves from aggression in Crimea and the Donbass region.

Second, I share that enthusiasm for Ukraine that is held by so many of my constituents, friends of mine, particularly in Cleveland and that area, who are proud members of the Ukrainian diaspora.

Third, I was very impressed with President Zelensky's election victory, in part because he received a remarkable 73 percent of the vote. I also thought his focus on reform and change was important for the country. I wanted to meet with him and learn more about how and why his appeals for unity largely succeeded.

Fourth, I wanted to hear more about his plans to fight the aggression from Russia on his eastern border, fight corruption at home, and put in place the reforms that will make his country stronger.

Finally, I wanted to tell him we are with him. The United States stands by Ukraine, and the ties between our two countries can deepen even further. We want to help Ukraine succeed in this historic moment.

I can report to my colleagues that I came away impressed from the meeting with President Zelensky. I was encouraged. We talked for about an hour and covered a broad range of topics. He is smart, engaging, and determined.

We had a good discussion about Russian aggression in Crimea and in the Donbass region. President Zelensky has been out to the contact line, which is where the fighting is occurring. I was there last year. There is a real war going on, and 13,000 people have been killed on the eastern border of Ukraine, on that contact line. He spoke frankly about the bravery of his troops but also about their needs in terms of the weapons systems and basic conditions. We talked about the Russian propaganda along the eastern border and the efforts to jam Ukrainian TV signals to sow the seeds for dissension for the people of the Donbass region. We talked about some ideas that would help to counter that propaganda, the jamming, and the disinformation, and I have already been in touch with the State Department about those ideas.

We also talked about the 24 Ukrainian sailors who were captured by the Russians last November 25 in the Kerch Strait in the Azov Sea. At that time, President Trump rightly refused to meet with President Putin until those sailors were free. President Zelensky and I talked about how to keep the pressure on Moscow to do the right thing. I gave President Zelensky my commitment to do everything in our power here in the Senate to keep these 24 sailors front and center until the crisis is resolved.

Recently, the United Nations issued a statement about these sailors, by the way. It read that they should be sent back to Ukraine, that their taking was wrong.

I told President Zelensky that he is now the face of reform in Ukraine and, indeed, for those of us who are watching around the world. He acknowledged that with a smile. He said that his commitment to reform is real, but he also had no illusions about how hard reform will be. Whether we are talking about fighting corruption, fighting for transparency in government, or fighting for civilian control of the military, I am very hopeful he will have the continued courage to see it through. He understands it is the only path forward and, frankly, is a linchpin of the U.S. partnership with Ukraine. As a matter of law, it is also a condition on our future defense assistance.

Finally, we talked about the importance of the Ukrainian diaspora in the United States—about 2 million people strong, thousands of whom live in Ohio, my constituents—and about how they are putting great hopes in his leadership and are willing to do all they can to help.

As I said, it was a very productive meeting, and I am grateful for his time. Of all of the messages of that discussion, the one that was the most important to me was when I asked him

how he could win by 73 percent of the vote. He said:

It was not about me. It was about change and reform and the betterment of the people of Ukraine.

It was a modest and appropriate response.

The messages of our discussion were reinforced in my meetings afterward with Lieutenant General Ruslan Khomchak. He is the new chief of the general staff of the Armed Forces of Ukraine—a man with great experience and knowledge. He was confident and well informed, and we had an open and detailed talk about how the United States can be helpful.

I have already begun to talk to my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and in the Trump administration about those specifics and some requests that he had.

So, my colleagues, I return from this brief trip to Ukraine hopeful—hopeful that Ukraine is ready to write the next chapter of its long history and that it will be a chapter of freedom with a government and society that benefits all of its citizens. The United States of America must continue to be a good friend and ally in that quest. I am certainly determined to do my part to make it so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1556

Ms. BALDWIN. I rise today to once again speak about the ongoing threat in the Trump administration to the healthcare and guaranteed protections that millions of American families depend upon. President Trump has tried to pass through the Congress repeal plans that would take people's healthcare away and allow insurance companies to discriminate against people with preexisting health conditions or refuse to serve them at all.

When that legislative repeal effort failed in 2017, instead of working in a bipartisan way to lower healthcare costs and improve access to care for all Americans, President Trump turned to another tactic—sabotaging our healthcare system—and there are more Americans uninsured today than there were when he took office.

The Trump administration has even gone to court. They have gone to court to support a lawsuit that would overturn the Affordable Care Act, including its provisions that protect people with preexisting health conditions from discrimination. Just think about that. He is asking a court to strike down healthcare protections for Americans. If he succeeds, insurance companies will once again be able to deny coverage or charge much higher premiums

for the more than 130 million Americans who have some sort of preexisting health condition, including more than 2 million who live in the State of Wisconsin.

What is the President's plan to protect people with preexisting conditions? He doesn't have one. He never has. And I have to say that I doubt he ever will. In fact, this administration has expanded what I call junk insurance plans. These are insurance plans that can deny coverage to people with preexisting health conditions, and they don't have to cover basic and essential health services, like prescription drugs or emergency room visits or maternity care. Most of these junk plans don't cover those things.

When I spoke about this expansion of what I call junk insurance on the Senate floor 2 weeks ago, one of my Republican colleagues responded and claimed that these plans preserve preexisting conditions protections and essential health benefits. So today I wanted to clarify the record, and let's look at the fine print together.

One of the junk plans currently available in my home State of Wisconsin reads, "This plan has a preexisting limitation provision that may prevent coverage from applying to medical conditions that existed prior to this plan's effective date."

Another junk plan that is sold in Wisconsin states that the plan does not comply with the guaranteed essential benefits provided by the Affordable Care Act. To quote directly, the description reads: "This coverage is not required to comply with certain federal market requirements for health insurance, principally those contained in the Affordable Care Act." The tiny fine print on this particular junk plan instructs individuals to check their coverage carefully to make sure they are "aware of any exclusions or limitation regarding coverage of pre-existing conditions or health benefits (such as hospitalization, emergency services, maternity care, preventive care, prescription drugs, and mental health and substance use disorder services). Your certificate might also have lifetime and/or annual dollar limits on health benefits."

The Affordable Care Act protects people against these insurance company abuses. Yet the expansion of these junk plans puts the power back in the hands of big insurance companies.

Let me be clear. American families do not want to go back to the days when health insurers could discriminate against people with preexisting health conditions, women, and seniors by denying them coverage or charging them higher premiums simply because they get sick.

As I have said in this Chamber many times, the people of Wisconsin want both parties in Congress to work together to make things better by making healthcare more affordable.

I have heard from several Wisconsinites who want to know why the Presi-

dent is working to repeal the Affordable Care Act and take away their protections by expanding these junk plans. They are frightened that if this sabotage of our health system continues, insurance companies will again be able to deny coverage or charge higher premiums for the more than 130 million Americans who have preexisting health conditions, again, including more than 2 million in my home State of Wisconsin.

I heard from Keri from Baraboo. Keri is a three-time cancer survivor—two breast cancer diagnoses and one melanoma. She experienced her first diagnosis at age 29. Now at age 61, Keri is able to get the healthcare she needs without being punished financially for having a preexisting condition. Keri is worried that if the Affordable Care Act is repealed, she could lose her health coverage or could be charged more because of her preexisting condition.

Another Wisconsinite, Keith in Brookfield, recently wrote in to my office about what healthcare means to him and his family. Keith and his son both have type 1 diabetes. Both of them have health insurance through the Affordable Care marketplace that allows them to afford the insulin, glucose test strips, and other medications they need. If the Affordable Care Act is repealed, Keith and his son likely would not even be eligible to purchase one of these junk insurance plans. They could be denied coverage entirely due to their preexisting condition.

We really need to act to stop this sabotage now. I want to protect the guaranteed healthcare protections that millions of Americans depend on. That is why I have introduced legislation, with my colleague, Senator DOUG JONES of Alabama, to overturn the Trump administration's expansion of junk insurance plans, because we should be increasing access to affordable, high-quality healthcare options.

The entire Senate Democratic caucus supports this legislation, along with the two Independents who caucus with us. The Nation's top healthcare organizations, representing tens of thousands of the Nation's physicians, patients, medical students, and other health experts, support this legislation.

Anyone who says they support healthcare coverage for people with preexisting conditions should support this bill.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1556; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me just say that the plans to which the Senator from Wisconsin is referring are plans that

tens of thousands of people are buying, and one of the reasons they are buying them is because it allows them to buy the insurance they want at a price they can afford.

I can tell you, as I am sure the Presiding Officer can and probably everybody here can, when they travel across the country and talk with the farmers and ranchers and people who are buying their insurance on the individual market, the individual market has blown up. It has exploded. People are paying \$3,000 a month in premiums—\$36,000 a year—and have huge deductibles. So what they are doing is they are dropping coverage because they can't afford it. One of the reasons they can't afford it is because, under ObamaCare, there were so many mandates and requirements, it drove up the price. So they have these skyrocketing premiums, higher deductibles, and higher copays.

I think that is precisely why the administration decided that, let's take these plans and give people an opportunity to buy the insurance they want at a price they can afford.

Literally tens of thousands of Americans are now in these plans. What the Senator from Wisconsin is saying is, we are going to throw all these people off these plans. What does that do? That puts them back out, probably uninsured, which is what a lot of farmers and ranchers in places in South Dakota are doing—they are just dropping coverage because they can't afford it. Who can afford to pay \$3,000 a month? That is what ObamaCare has left us. That is why we need new solutions. This solution is one that allows people to buy a plan they want at a price they can afford, coupled with association health plans—which Democrats, I think, here in the Senate are also objecting to and opposing—which are also giving individuals opportunities to join larger groups and spread their risk and drive down their premiums. We need plans that people in this country can afford, or more and more people are going to be in the ranks of the uninsured.

So, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues have once again chosen to object to protecting people with preexisting conditions.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, would my colleague yield?

Ms. BALDWIN. Senator, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague. I am in such strong support of her legislation, the No Junk Plans Act. I will speak briefly on it after the Senator has concluded her important remarks. But apropos of what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota just said, isn't it correct that of course a plan is more affordable if it doesn't cover anything? I would be interested in my colleague's reaction to that, as she is the lead sponsor.



I remember being in Wisconsin and seeing the wonderful support folks there have from my colleague because she has been a leader on these issues.

I am just curious, because certainly my friend from South Dakota, who is a distinguished member of the Finance Committee and works with Senator CORTEZ MASTO and me, often works with us on matters. But unless I am missing something, he said that what he is interested in is care that is more affordable. But it doesn't cover anything. What are my colleague's thoughts on that?

Ms. BALDWIN. I would concur and say that the reason they have earned the nickname "junk plans" is because, frankly, some of them are hardly worth the paper they are written on.

First of all, they do not have to comply with some of the very important protections we included as part of the Affordable Care Act—otherwise known as ObamaCare—especially to protect people who have been ill once before or have been injured once before, people who have a preexisting health condition, maybe a chronic condition that will require medical care throughout their lives.

In the old days, which apparently the Republican Senator wants to return to, there were all sorts of abuses, I would argue, that insurance companies could employ in order to limit their exposure, if you will. They had annual limits. They had lifetime limits. They had the capacity to drop somebody from coverage after an illness developed. They had the capacity to say: No, we are not going to offer you insurance. They certainly had the capacity to charge discriminatory premiums based on the preexisting condition. That causes great concern.

I just recently saw a report about how much a typical—put it this way: a woman with a breast cancer diagnosis who requires chemotherapy and radiation treatment and medication—how much she would be anticipated to spend out-of-pocket if she had a junk plan at the time that diagnosis was made. It was, on average, \$40,000.

We also need to talk about another impact these junk plans have, and that is, if you think you have a really good chance of being healthy for the next year, and you decide "This is a risk I can take," you are then fundamentally changing the structure of the marketplace for everyone else. You can anticipate that this is a choice healthier, maybe younger people will make, and it has a distorting impact on premiums in the marketplace. In fact, that is why these plans were curtailed under the previous administration. Now, this administration is greatly expanding these. They are no longer short term. They are long term, and a lot of harm will come.

I want to conclude and say that when we have an administration that first fought legislatively to repeal the Affordable Care Act and then acted administratively to undermine and sabo-

tage the Affordable Care Act through all sorts of administrative Executive actions, including defunding the State navigators who helped people make wise selections for their insurance and also limiting the open enrollment period, and when we have an administration that has decided to go to court and asked the court to strike down a U.S. law in its entirety, we know there is sabotage going on.

I think the choice for the American people couldn't be clearer. We want to make things better, and the administration—enabled by some of my Senate Republican colleagues—is walking down a path that has led to 2 million people losing their health insurance and others at grave risk of losing it in the future.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before she leaves the floor, I want to tell my colleague from Wisconsin—and I think I speak for the distinguished Senator from Nevada as well—we are counting on our colleague from Wisconsin to come back to this floor again and again to try to pass her bill. I just want to tell her I will be with her every step of the way because I think, colleagues, without the bill from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, what we are looking at is a new golden age for scam artists peddling insurance that isn't worth much more than the paper it is written on.

I was struck by my friend from Wisconsin's mentioning the old days of junk insurance.

Well, I was around for those old days. I remember when the health insurance system in this country was basically for the healthy and wealthy. If you were healthy, no sweat, you could get insurance. If you were wealthy, you just went off and paid the bills. But the insurance companies could go out there and clobber people with preexisting conditions. So that was junk insurance.

But I am even older than that. I remember when I was director of the Oregon Gray Panthers. I would go to a senior's house, and they would pull out a shoebox full of policies—10 or 15 policies. The distinguished Senator from Nevada, who has done so much consumer advocacy for consumers, I am sure knows about this challenge with seniors. These policies weren't worth the paper they were written on. They had—because I am kind of a lawyer in name only—what were called subrogation clauses. So if you had two policies, and they basically covered the same thing, both of them would try to squirm out of covering it. Talk about junk insurance.

Finally, I got elected to Congress, like my colleague activist, and we passed a law that said we are going to get rid of that system and that you could have really only one policy, except in unusual situations. There were strong consumer protections.

But if you look at what the Trump golden age of scams is going to bring back, there are going to be lots of people who are going to get clobbered, and, as my colleagues know, the people who are really going to get hit by this are, for example, older women who are pre-Medicare, because very often, in their late fifties and early sixties, they have a lot of difficulty trying to find jobs that pay good salaries and jobs that have good healthcare coverage.

I am so appreciative of what my colleague is talking about.

We are going to hear a lot of buzz words. Opponents of the Baldwin legislation are going to talk about how they are offering flexibility and they are offering patient-centered care. But that is just a bunch of eyewash because what they really do, as you touched on, is to fail to give patients care when they most need care.

Today, Americans ought to be protected from these worthless, predatory scams. One of the things that I was proudest of, really, before my colleagues came here, is a piece of legislation I wrote, the Healthy Americans Act. A number of Republican Senators were cosponsors of this bill. It had airtight, loophole-free protection to ensure that people with preexisting conditions didn't face discrimination.

By and large, we got that provision into the Affordable Care Act. It meant, as John McCain knew—we often talked about it—that healthcare would no longer be there just for the healthy and the wealthy. There would be real protections for those with preexisting conditions.

For all practical purposes, that was really one of the two or three centerpieces of the Affordable Care Act, because, talk about a new age in insurance, that was it. Healthcare insurance would no longer be there for the healthy and wealthy only.

Senator BALDWIN is here, and what she is trying to do—I am looking at that clock—is trying to keep the Trump people from turning it back. That is what they want to do when Senator BALDWIN talks about the old days—a forced march back to the days when the insurance companies could really, in many instances, just beat the stuffing out of vulnerable people.

I thank my colleague for what she is doing. I heard just a little bit about it before I came over. I basically said: Let's hold off on things for a couple of hours so I can go out there and stand with Senator BALDWIN and her allies.

I say to the Senator: To me, what is important is that you have been here today, and it is going to be even more important that you come back again and again and again so that that clock continues to move forward in terms of American healthcare and not go backward. I thank my colleague.

We are really delighted to have Senator CORTEZ MASTO on the Senate Finance Committee, where she has been doing a lot of good work in healthcare



for consumers and seniors. I look forward to her remarks and to working with both of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, let me just say, on behalf of the State of Nevada, that I am so appreciative that I get to work with my colleagues from Wisconsin and Oregon. I thank them for their commitment because this is the No. 1 issue in the State of Nevada.

I say to Senator BALDWIN: What you are doing is really standing up for people and their right to have access to affordable healthcare in this country when they need it, access to medication when they need it, and the comfort in knowing that if they purchase a plan, if something, God forbid, should happen to them, then, they will have access to that medication and those doctors when they need it. Thank you for your hard work.

I stand today because I want to tell you about one of these people in the State of Nevada. Her name is Carol Elewski. She is from Reno, NV. Carol has chronic asthma. She manages it with medications that cost up to \$400 a month—\$400 a month.

In October of 2016, Carol had such a bad asthma attack that she was admitted to the hospital for 10 days as doctors struggled to get her breathing under control. Thankfully, today Carol's health is stable, but because of her preexisting condition and high prescription drug costs, she depends on the protections of the Affordable Care Act to keep her healthcare costs in check.

This administration, as we have heard today from my colleagues, keeps chipping away at those protections. Literally, we have heard from the President that he is proud of sabotaging the Affordable Care Act. He has weakened the ACA by expanding access to these junk plans. These short-term, limited-duration plans don't cover essential services, like prescription drugs, emergency rooms visits, and maternity care.

Today, I am joining my colleagues to, once again, urge that we do away with these scam insurance policies. These plans appeal to consumers because they are low cost, but they are also low benefit, as we have heard. Many people who purchase them don't realize just how limited the coverage is. All those details are in the fine print of the policies in dense legal jargon, and it is nearly impossible to understand. I am an attorney, and I will tell you that even attorneys have difficulty understanding that dense legal jargon in some of these policies. Consumers don't know that the plans they are signing up for—because of the dense legal jargon and because they are not given specifics, and there is not enough transparency—don't even cover their preexisting conditions. Consumers may not realize that their coverage has annual or lifetime spending caps.

Take Carol, for instance. Let's say she had signed up for a junk plan instead of an ACA-compliant plan—an easy mistake to make, since companies hide the differences between the two. With the junk plan, Carol's insurance could have refused to cover her healthcare costs because of her asthma. They could have denied payment for the emergency treatment she needed when she literally could not breathe, and they could have declined coverage for the essential medications she needs to keep the asthma in check.

Under these junk plans, women who get pregnant don't get coverage for prenatal care or for delivering their babies. People with lifelong genetic conditions, like cystic fibrosis, can be denied coverage, as can those facing mental health issues.

What is more, even if you don't buy a junk healthcare plan, these plans' very existence drives up our healthcare costs in this country. That is because younger, healthier people are more likely to risk choosing a limited junk plan because those plans are cheaper. That leaves the rest of the population, including many women and children, in a much more expensive insurance pool.

Estimates say that junk plans could cost a family of four with an ACA plan over \$3,000 in increased insurance premiums every year. The No Junk Plans Act that Senator BALDWIN has introduced undoes the administration's order that allowed insurance companies to offer consumers up to 3 years of deceptive, skimpy coverage.

Under the No Junk Plans Act, customers can only use these short-term plans for 90 days. The plans would work the way they were intended—as a bridge between coverage at one job and the next.

I hear this all the time in Nevada. Americans have told us time and again what they want their healthcare to do: to cover preexisting conditions, keep down prescription drug costs, include women's health, cover mental health, and pay for emergency rooms visits.

I am going to continue to fight for what the American people want, and that is the comprehensive coverage of the Affordable Care Act.

We cannot let the administration succeed in doing an end-run around the ACA. The House has already passed legislation to do away with these flimsy and deceptive junk plans. Now it is time for the Senate to step up and do the same.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Senator UDALL pertaining to the submission of S. 1753 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. LEE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SENATE PAGES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today is the last day of the session for

the Senate pages who served during the spring semester. I want to thank them for their hard work and service to the Senate over the last 4 months. I wish you all well as you return to your home States with a greater appreciation for the Senate and our work here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of pages graduating this week be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Meg Balaji  
Elizabeth Bates  
Craig Birkhead-Morton  
Jackson Cargill  
Olivia Castilla  
Michael Cathy  
Brooke Culp  
William Deaton  
Gabe Fanning  
Caroline Ferry  
Cameron Fowler  
Sophie Hart  
Laura Hartman  
Ruthie Kesri  
Joe Lesser  
Dan McDermott  
George Moore  
Virginia Pillion  
Katerina Retzlaff  
Bella Sandoval-Encinas  
Matthew Shabino  
Caleb Shriver  
Hunter Steinlage  
Kara Swain  
Colby Switser  
Teagan Thompson  
John Wahlig III  
Jamie Yoder

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I might just add that, frequently, it is difficult to go back to boring high school. So I hope you are all able to acclimate yourselves to the real world again and always remember your experience here in the greatest deliberative body in the world.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 252; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

The following named officer for appointment as Commandant of the Marine Corps and appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 8043: To be General

Lt. Gen. David H. Berger

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN J. SCATES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, every day, the American farmer works hard to keep the faith and survive unknowns—from changes in the marketplace or the unpredictability of the weather, to changes in public policy. We saw that in the 1980s with disruptions in our export markets, depressed prices, creeping debt, and high production costs. We see that same today. Just like then, Illinois farm families have a trusted person fighting to keep their operations strong and to help pave the way for a stronger future for farming—his name is Steve Scates.

I am here today to honor my friend Steve, who was recently named one of this year's Southern Illinois University Distinguished Alumni. He has more than earned this prestigious recognition.

A native of Shawneetown in southern Illinois, Steve has worked his entire life in agriculture, from production agriculture with his grandfather, who founded Pat Scates and Sons Farm, to developing public policy that supports our farmers. Ever since he earned his bachelor's degree from Southern Illinois University in 1959 in animal sciences, Steve has been actively involved in a wide range of professional agricultural organizations, including in several leadership posts, like chair of the Illinois Soybean Association board of directors.

President Bill Clinton recognized Steve's experience and hard work supporting the Illinois farming community by appointing him the State Executive Director for the Illinois offices of the USDA Farm Service Agency, where he served for 8 years and played a critical role in the implementation of the 1996 farm bill programs.

He went on to serve as chairperson of the Illinois Council for Food and Agricultural Research. During his time there, he received more awards than can be counted, including the Farm Bureau Eagle Award, the USDA Secretary's Award, and the SIU College of Agricultural Sciences 2008 Outstanding Alumni Award.

With all the awards and recognition, Steve's career has really been about helping people. While he is part of one of the largest farming operations in Illinois, he has always worked to look out for the interests of the smallest of farming operations to ensure they received a fair shake.

Although today they say that Steve has retired from farming, I know that he is still actively involved and serves as a senior partner at Pat Scates and Sons Farms and on the board of directors for Scates Gardens, Inc. Steve is never far from his partner and wife, Kappy, and his heart is always with his fabulous family.

Illinois agriculture is lucky to have a champion like Steve and his family still going strong in the farming community. America and Illinois need leaders like Steve now more than ever.

## VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 141, the confirmation of Susan Combs to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

I was necessarily absent but had I been present, would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 142, the motion to invoke cloture on Ryan T. Holte, to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 143, the motion to invoke cloture on Rossie David Alston, Jr., to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 144, the motion to invoke cloture on Richard A. Hertling, to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

## VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for vote No. 137 on the confirmation of David Schenker to be an Assistant Secretary of State. On vote No. 137, had I been present, I would have voted yea on confirmation.

I was also necessarily absent for vote No. 138 on the confirmation of Heath Tarbert to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and for vote No. 139 on the confirmation of Heath Tarbert to be Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. On vote No. 138 and vote No. 139, had I been present, I would have voted yea on confirmation to be Chairman and Commissioner.

I was also necessarily absent for vote No. 140 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Susan Combs to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. On vote No. 140, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture.

## 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, later today, I will be leaving with many other Senators on an official trip to Normandy, France, to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the D-day invasion, also known as Operation Overlord. I

consider it a high honor to be part of a congressional delegation commemorating one of the most important days in the history of human civilization. It is especially important to make this trip at a time when relations with our traditional trans-Atlantic allies are under undue and unnecessary stress.

On June 6, 1944, the largest single amphibious assault in history crossed the English Channel and stormed the beaches of Normandy, code-named "Utah," "Omaha," "Gold," "Juno," and "Sword," names that will be forever associated with acts of uncommon valor and self-sacrifice in defense of human freedom and dignity. The Allied armada involved over 156,000 U.S., British, and Canadian troops traveling aboard almost 7,000 naval ships and landing vessels.

Even before the amphibious assault, in the darkened skies of that early morning, 13,100 American paratroopers of the 82nd and 101st Airborne Divisions made parachute drops near Carentan from over 2,000 Allied aircraft, followed by 3,937 troops flown in by day on 867 gliders as the opening maneuver of Operation Neptune, the assault operation for Overlord.

Three of the six Allied divisions involved in D-day were American, including the 29th Infantry Division. The 29th Infantry Division was activated on February 3, 1941, and based at Fort Meade, MD. It consisted of soldiers from Maryland and Virginia. In September 1942, the 29th deployed to England, where it made final preparations for the D-day invasion.

Operation Overlord called for Allied troops to storm ashore five landing areas along the 50-mile stretch of Normandy's shore. U.S. forces were responsible for taking Utah and Omaha. Securing Omaha was critical to the Allies' success and would be the site of the heaviest German resistance. The 29th and the 1st Infantry Division were responsible for taking Omaha. Nearly 10,000 men of the 29th formed the first assault wave on Omaha. At approximately 6:30 in the morning on June 6th, Allied forces encountered stormy seas, a low tide, reinforced obstacles, and a force of 50,000 German troops awaiting them on Normandy's 50-mile shoreline.

George "Billy" Forbes, Jr., of Bryantown, MD, was a radio operator in the 29th Infantry Division. Mr. Forbes described his feelings before the D-day invasion as "very anxious and very scared." He said that even though he did not know what to expect, he had a job to do, and he was going to do it to the best of his ability.

Lester Lease of Cumberland, MD, was only 16 years old when he lied about his age to join the Army. He was a sergeant in the 29th when he landed at Omaha Beach. Mr. Lease stressed the difficulty of the amphibious assault. The "Higgins boats" could not get close enough to shore for the soldiers to get off on the land, so they had to swim through deep water before they could wade or crawl ashore. Many of

them perished in the onslaught of withering German machine gun and artillery fire before they even made it to shore. Those who did make it to the beaches encountered thick shell smoke that obstructed their visibility, and they heard the cries for help from their fellow soldiers lying wounded nearby as German machine gun fire relentlessly rained down on them.

Charles “Harry” Heinlein, a 22-year-old Army private from Baltimore, MD, described the scene as total confusion, recalling, “It seemed like hours to get off the beach. At this point, the only orders being yelled to those still able to fight was, ‘Get off the beach! Get off the beach!’”

William Bladen of College Park, MD, was a 19-year-old paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division. In the dark, early hours of that morning, Private First Class Bladen parachuted into Normandy with two 20-pound satchels of TNT attached to him and unable to see where he would land. Mr. Bladen said, “War is hell—in fact, it’s worse than hell.” But he had a mission and he did it.

Joe Heinlein of Parkville, MD, provided context to the American casualties suffered. He pointed out that before D-day, Bravo Company, 175th Regiment, of the 29th Infantry Division, had about 200 men; by June 19 about a dozen men remained. Mr. Bladen added, “I hope people remember that a lot of men gave their lives for others.”

Freedom is not free. The Normandy American Cemetery serves as the final resting place for 9,380 American military dead, most of whom lost their lives in the D-day landings. On the Walls of the Missing are inscribed another 1,557 names of soldiers whose remains were never recovered or identified. We must never forget those who, in Abraham Lincoln’s immortal words, “have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.” The Americans who died on the beaches and in the fields of Normandy made the ultimate sacrifice, but they did not die in vain. They helped to defeat fascism, totalitarianism, and the Nazi regime. They helped to liberate Europe and the concentration camps. In GEN Dwight Eisenhower’s D-day address, he declared to Allied troops, “The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you . . . The free men of the world are marching together to victory.”

We remember and we honor the intrepid heroes of the 29th Infantry Division and all the other members of the “Greatest generation” who marched together into battle and demonstrated remarkable acts of valor and sacrifice 75 years ago tomorrow.

As the poet Archibald MacLeish wrote, “There are those who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is the American Dream.” But it is a dream

that we Americans share with all people who cherish freedom and human dignity now, just as we did on June 6th, 1944.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am proud to rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the day my home State of Wisconsin became the first State in the Nation to ratify the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, giving women the right to vote.

Although the outcome was a historic victory, women did not gain the right to vote without a struggle. The road to Wisconsin’s ratification of the 19th Amendment was paved with more than 70 years of advocacy and speeches, marches and rallies, legislation and lawsuits by strong Wisconsin suffragists. Many of the battles were lost before they were won.

When Wisconsin became a State in 1848, only White male landowners over 21 years of age could vote. In 1869, women won the right to run for local school boards in Wisconsin but ironically could not vote for themselves. In 1886, Wisconsin voters approved a statewide referendum allowing women to vote in school elections. When women tried to exercise their new rights for the first time in 1887, however, many women’s ballots were discarded because there was no way to verify that women voted only in school elections. Racine suffragist Olympia Brown sued to have her ballot accepted, but the State supreme court said the law was vague and needed to be rewritten. Fourteen years later, the Wisconsin Legislature approved the creation of separate ballots for women that only included school elections.

In 1911, Wisconsin suffragists persuaded the legislature to authorize a statewide referendum on voting rights for women, but it was soundly defeated by an electorate that didn’t include women. Two years later, the legislature again called for a referendum on women’s suffrage, but it was vetoed by the Governor. In 1915, another attempt at a referendum was rejected by lawmakers.

Women’s suffrage fared much better when the debate over voting rights shifted from individual States to the national stage. Congress passed the 19th Amendment on June 4, 1919. Less than a week later, on June 10th, the Wisconsin Legislature ratified the amendment, narrowly beating out its neighbor to the south. Illinois had actually ratified the amendment an hour before Wisconsin, but a paperwork error delayed the filing of the Illinois documents. By August 26, 1920, the necessary 36 States had ratified the 19th Amendment, and women were granted full voting rights.

As we celebrate the centennial of this historic moment, it is important to acknowledge that ratification of the 19th Amendment did not extend voting

rights to all women. Advocacy for suffrage for Black women was often abandoned in an attempt to gain support for ratification in the South. African-American women faced disenfranchisement tactics that ranged from separate long lines and civics tests to poll taxes and even beatings. Many of these tactics continued until passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Wisconsin owes its unique position in history to the voices of powerful Wisconsin women who not only spoke truth to power but who also shattered the glass ceiling in their professional lives. Belle Case LaFollette, originally from Summit, was the first woman to graduate from law school in Wisconsin. Laura Ross Wolcott from Milwaukee was Wisconsin’s first woman physician. Olympia Brown of Racine was the first woman to be ordained a minister in the entire country. Nationally renowned suffragist Carrie Chapman Catt from Ripon was indispensable to passage of the amendment. As the first woman to represent Wisconsin in the U.S. House of Representatives and now the U.S. Senate, I am humbled to walk the path these strong women helped forge for their successors.

One hundred years ago, after decades of struggle by brave women and men, our Nation finally extended to women the most fundamental right in our democracy—the right to vote. As we celebrate this historic milestone in our Nation’s history, let us vow to continue to fight for full equality for women, including access to health care, in workplace salaries, and in representation the Halls of Congress.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING DON FRASER

● Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge the passing of a true champion for good—former Congressman, Minneapolis mayor, and my friend and neighbor—Don Fraser, who died at the age of 95 on June 2, 2019. Those who knew him best described Don as thoughtful, decent, intelligent, tough, and absolutely wonderful.

Don Fraser was born in Minneapolis, MN, in 1924. He fought in World War II and later studied law at the University of Minnesota Law School. He joined the law firm of Larson, Loevinger, Lindquist, Freeman, and Fraser before he was elected to the Minnesota State Senate in 1954. In 1962, Don was elected to the House of Representatives, representing Minnesota’s Fifth District, where he served for 16 years. Don went on to serve as mayor of Minneapolis from 1980 to 1994, making him the longest serving mayor in Minneapolis history.

Don was married to Arvonne Skelton Fraser, who dedicated her life to improving the lives of women around the world. Together, they had six children: Thomas, Mary, John, Lois, Anne, and Jean.

Known as the Quiet Crusader, Don was always ahead of his time. As a Congressman, he fought for the environment and human rights and exposed human rights abuses around the world. As mayor of Minneapolis—a job he believed was truly the most rewarding of his career—he advocated for early childhood education and put an end to the ingrained politics of the city's police department. Tom Fraser may have summed up his father's service best when he said, "He persuaded people by the power of his argument, not the volume of his speech." Public service was Don's calling.

My first job in Democratic politics was serving as the volunteer president of the DFL Education Foundation, a group Don Fraser founded. His mission? Ideas matter in politics. And he lived that. Don and Arvonne were the heart and soul of the group.

In this era of sound bites and quick fixes to problems, Don and Arvonne yearned for something more substantial in the way they talked about issues. They worked to promote more citizen involvement in politics.

I remember when Don used to introduce me at events during my run for Hennepin County attorney, and he used to say, "I used to work for the city of Minneapolis." In reality, Don has never stopped working for Minneapolis and his country. Don was a great public servant and an outstanding mentor to the next generation. He understood that his public service didn't end with him.

It has been said that it is lucky to have somebody who makes it hard to say goodbye. It is hard to say goodbye to Don Fraser, but I count myself lucky to have known him as a friend. My family and I greatly miss Don. We miss seeing him walking with Arvonne arm in arm in our neighborhood, and we miss their passion for public service and their love for their family and friends.●

#### TRIBUTE TO PETER MELVIN THOMPSON, JR.

● Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and celebrate the life of Peter Melvin Thompson, Jr., a decorated Vietnam war veteran and proud member of the White Earth Nation, who passed away on Wednesday, January 30, 2019. Today, on June 5, 2019, Mr. Thompson will be buried with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery for his service to this country. He is the first member of the White Earth Nation to receive this honor.

Mr. Thompson served in the Army for 12 years, during which time he received six Purple Hearts, one Silver Star with valor device, and 3 Bronze Stars with valor device. In 1960, at the age of 17, Mr. Thompson talked his dad into signing papers allowing him to enlist in the U.S. Army. He attended basic training and was posted to Fort Leonard Wood, MO, before volunteering to go to fight

in the Vietnam war. Mr. Thompson deployed twice to Vietnam, first with the First Cavalry Regiment in central Vietnam from January 1968 to 1969. During this deployment, Mr. Thompson was wounded twice and earned a Bronze Star.

Soon after returning to the States, Mr. Thompson volunteered for a second tour in Vietnam. During his second tour, Mr. Thompson served as platoon leader in charge of seven armored personnel carriers and three tanks. He was wounded four more times. In 1970, while on a rescue mission, Mr. Thompson was injured in combat for the last time. He was airlifted to Hawk Hill, where he helped identify all the lost men in his platoon before being sent to a field hospital to begin recovery. Mr. Thompson was transferred to Colorado, where he finished his recuperation and served as a probation officer at Fort Carson before being discharged in 1972.

Mr. Thompson met and married Evelyn Auginaush on July 10, 1973 at St. Phillips Church in Rice Lake, MN. Together they moved throughout Minnesota before returning to Mr. Thompson's home in Rice Lake. Never one to be idle, Mr. Thompson found work as a trapper for the State and Tribe Predator Control and also worked at the Leech Lake Indian Health Hospital Facilities as a manager, where he won two awards for his service. Mr. Thompson's time in the military also left an indelible mark on his life and led him to start the White Earth Honor Guard, which he remained a part of throughout his life.

Today, Mr. Thompson is being laid to rest with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery by his wife Evelyn, daughters Cheryl and Carol, 15 grandchildren, 6 great grandchildren, and many others. I am proud today to recognize Peter Thompson for his service to this country, to Minnesota, and to the White Earth Nation.●

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS ALASKA

● Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, this week we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of Special Olympics Alaska, an organization that has done so much for so many Alaskans living with intellectual disabilities in my State and across the globe.

The rise of the Special Olympics is one of the world's great stories. It demonstrates both on the political and personal fronts what can happen when a group of people get together to ensure that everyone has the ability to participate in sports and, furthermore, develop skills and friendships that will last them a lifetime.

The story of Special Olympics dates back to the 1960s, when one woman, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, decided to make a difference. Mrs. Shriver had a sister, Rosemary, who had an intellectual disability and with whom she was very close. She knew that Rosemary's disability shouldn't hold her or anybody

else back from competing in sports and fulfilling her dreams.

In the summer of 1968 in Chicago, Eunice Shriver opened the first national games for Special Olympics. One thousand athletes from 26 States and Canada competed in track & field and swimming. Jump forward to today. Because of Mrs. Shriver's vision and advocacy for people with intellectual disabilities, there are now nearly 5 million Special Olympics' athletes around the world, and as many as 80,000 competitions are held every year, including in the great State of Alaska.

In 2001, Alaska hosted the Special Olympics World Winter Games. Mrs. Shriver said it was the best World Winter Games in Special Olympics history. That success was only possible because of the hard working staff, board, volunteers, and athletes from the Special Olympics Alaska organization and the complete support of a caring, engaged community.

Special Olympics Alaska will be celebrating its 50th anniversary this weekend in conjunction with the Special Olympics Alaska Summer Games. Hundreds of athletes and unified partners from across the State will gather in Anchorage for 3 days of competition. They have been dedicated to their training in aquatics, basketball, gymnastics, powerlifting, and track & field, and this weekend will strive for their personal best and, no doubt, have a lot of fun. There is no better place to see the joy of competition and pure sportsmanship than at a Special Olympics event.

My family is proud to be part of a community that supports our Special Olympics athletes and, to brag a little, part of a State with a world-class training center and program that is the envy of many other States and nations. Special Olympics Alaska's success would not be possible without the dedicated support of so many Alaska families and the passion our athletes have for sports and this organization. Our athletes inspire all of us. They show us the true meaning of grit, determination, and perseverance. Our athletes know, more than any of us, what Vince Lombardi meant when he said, "It's not whether you get knocked down; it's whether you get up."

Congratulations again to all the athletes, staff, board, and volunteers of Special Olympics Alaska for an incredible 50 years of serving the community.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations

and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:20 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1379. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6. An act to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2157. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The message further announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 945S(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: Ms. Gina Maria Ortiz Jones of San Antonio, Texas.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 6. An act to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Penthiopyrad; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL 9993-11-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1547. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Provision Regarding Availability of Specifications and Standards Not Listed in the Acquisition Streamlining and Standardiza-

tion Information System" ((RIN0750-AK42) (DFARS Case 2019-D007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1548. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause 'Ordering Limitation'" ((RIN0750-AK64) (DFARS Case 2019-D023)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1549. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indexing, Public Inspection, and Federal Register Publication of Department of Navy Directive and Other Documents Affecting the Public" ((RIN0703-AB02) (32 CFR Part 701) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1550. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States Navy Regulations and Official Records" ((RIN0703-AB06) (32 CFR Part 700) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1551. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certifications and Exemptions Under the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972" ((RIN0703-AB03) (32 CFR Part 706) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1552. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Rules with Respect to Additional Station and Signal Lights" ((RIN0703-AB04) (32 CFR Part 707) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1553. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Missing Persons Act" ((RIN0703-AB07) (32 CFR Part 718) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1554. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Payments of Amounts Due Mentally Incompetent Members of the Naval Service" ((RIN0703-AB16) (32 CFR Part 726) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1555. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical and Dental Care for Eligible Persons at Navy Department Facilities" ((RIN0703-AB09) (32 CFR Part 728) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1556. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of De-

fense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Non Naval Medical and Dental Care" ((RIN0703-AB10) (32 CFR Part 732) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1557. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assistance to and Support of Dependents; Paternity Complaints" ((RIN0703-AA96) (32 CFR Part 733)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1558. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Garnishment of Pay of Naval Military and Civilian Personnel for Collection of Child Support and Alimony" ((RIN0703-AA97) (32 CFR Part 734)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1559. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disposition of Property" ((RIN0703-AB05) (32 CFR Part 736)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1560. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules Governing Public Access" ((RIN0703-AB00) (32 CFR Part 763)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1561. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Contracting by Negotiations" ((RIN0703-AB13) (48 CFR Part 5215)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1562. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Contract Administration" ((RIN0703-AB14) (48 CFR Part 5242)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1563. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses" ((RIN0703-AB15) (48 CFR Part 5252)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1564. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan, Permit to Install Public Hearing Provisions" (FRL No. 9994-65-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1565. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Michigan; Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9994-75-Region 5)

received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1566. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Priorities List; Correction" (FRL No. 9994-86-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1567. A communication from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's 2019 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1568. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2017 annual report relative to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1569. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2018 through March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1570. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting proposed legislation that would reauthorize the Department's pipeline safety program for fiscal years 2020-2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1571. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Training, Qualification, and Oversight for Safety-Related Railroad Employees" (RIN2130-AC70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1572. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hackensack River, Little Ferry, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0108)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1573. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Annual Boyne Thunder Poker Run; Charlevoix, MI" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2018-1098)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1574. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Upper Potomac River, National Harbor, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0203)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1575. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, New Orleans, LA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0243)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1576. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 0.0 to Mile 0.6, Pittsburgh, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0230)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1577. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0344)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1578. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Prom Fireworks Display; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1579. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; July 4th Holiday Fireworks in the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Maryland-National Capital Region Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0193)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1580. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Buffalo Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0121)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1581. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Marine Radar Observer Refresher Training Regulations" ((RIN1625-AC46) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0100)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1582. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Delivery of MVPD Communications; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative" ((FCC 18-166) (MB Docket Nos. 17-317 and 17-105)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1590. A bill to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-44).

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

\*James Byrne, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1717. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to make certain multivitamin-mineral dietary supplements eligible for purchase with supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1718. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1719. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1720. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to allow the interstate sale of State-inspected meat and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1721. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit gay and trans panic defenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1722. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize State-licensed appraisers to conduct appraisals in connection with mortgages insured by the FHA and to ensure compliance with the existing appraiser education and competency requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1723. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SASSE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):



S. 1724. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to modify the offenses relating to fentanyl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1725. A bill to permit occupational therapists to conduct the initial assessment visit and complete the comprehensive assessment under a Medicare home health plan of care for certain rehabilitation cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1726. A bill to ensure high-income earners pay a fair share of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1727. A bill to establish the Partnership Fund for Peace to promote joint economic development and finance ventures between Palestinian entrepreneurs and companies and those in the United States and Israel to improve economic cooperation and people-to-people peacebuilding programs, and to further shared community building, peaceful coexistence, dialogue, and reconciliation between Israelis and Palestinians; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1728. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer's semipostal stamp for 6 additional years; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1729. A bill to enhance consumer rights relating to consumer report disputes by requiring provision of documentation provided by consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1730. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to make grants to State and local governments and nongovernmental organizations for purposes of carrying out climate-resilient living shoreline projects that protect coastal communities by supporting ecosystem functions and habitats with the use of natural materials and systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1731. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to require the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to maintain a list of certain foreign issuers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1732. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide rules for the disallowance and recapture of certain charitable contributions to colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1733. A bill to limit the separation of children from their parents or legal guardians, to limit the detention of families and children, to provide unaccompanied alien children with access to counsel, to increase the number of immigration judges and support staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 1734. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the District of Columbia to receive Federal funding under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1735. A bill to provide women with increased access to preventive and life-saving cancer screening; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1736. A bill to prohibit the transfer of operations and closure of Forest Service Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1737. A bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 1738. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to take initiatives to measure the impact of automation on the workforce in order to inform workforce development strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1739. A bill to enable projects that will aid in the development and delivery of related instruction associated with apprenticeship and preapprenticeship programs that are focused on serving the skilled technical workforce at the National Laboratories and certain facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1740. A bill to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the flexibility, efficiency, and reliability of the electric grid, to increase the competitiveness of the United States economy, to protect consumers, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1741. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1742. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish certain demonstration grant programs relating to the demonstration of advanced distribution systems, smart water heaters, vehicle-to-grid integration, and granular retail electricity pricing, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. JONES, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1743. A bill to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1744. A bill to provide lawful permanent resident status for certain advanced STEM degree holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1745. A bill to establish a cost of greenhouse gases for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide to be used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. REED):

S. 1746. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to authorize the provision of technical assistance under the Preserve America Program and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into partnerships with communities adjacent to units of the National Park System to leverage local cultural heritage tourism assets; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1747. A bill to require that any trade agreement eligible for expedited consideration by Congress include enforceable standards requiring paying adequate wages and maintaining sustainable production methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1748. A bill to decrease the frequency of sports blackouts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1749. A bill to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1750. A bill to establish the Clean School Bus Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1751. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; to



the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. LEE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 1752. A bill to allow a State to submit a declaration of intent to the Secretary of Education to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1753. A bill to promote accountability and effective administration in the execution of laws by restoring the original understanding of the President's constitutional power to remove subordinates from office; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Australia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 47. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. REED):

S.J. Res. 48. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 231. A resolution condemning the horrific anti-Semitic attack on the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, on April 27, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 232. A resolution calling for the immediate extradition or expulsion to the United States of convicted felons Joanne Chesimard and William Morales and all other fugitives from justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba in order to escape prosecution or confinement for criminal offenses committed in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 233. A resolution recognizing the importance of protecting freedom of speech, thought, and expression at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. Res. 234. A resolution affirming the United States commitment to the two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and noting that Israeli annexation of territory in the West Bank would undermine peace and Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. Res. 235. A resolution designating June 12, 2019, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 236. A resolution reaffirming the strong partnership between Tunisia and the United States and supporting the people of Tunisia in their continued pursuit of democratic reforms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. Res. 237. A resolution supporting the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights Week in 2019, which include increasing public awareness of the rights, needs, and concerns of, and services available to assist, victims and survivors of crime in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. PAUL):

S. Res. 238. A resolution designating the week of June 3 through June 9, 2019, as "Hemp History Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, and Ms. ERNST):

S. Res. 239. A resolution designating June 2019 as "Great Outdoors Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. Con. Res. 19. A concurrent resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 64

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 64, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

S. 120

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 120, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cospon-

sors of S. 177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 191

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 191, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in periodic health assessments, separation history and physical examinations, and other assessments an evaluation of whether a member of the Armed Forces has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 239

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs that support interprofessional geriatric education and training to develop a geriatric-capable workforce, improving health outcomes for a growing and diverse aging American population and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 343

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the credit for new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles and to provide for a Federal highway user fee on alternative fuel vehicles.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation and regulation of marijuana products, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The

American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 512, a bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 645

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 645, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of homeschooled students in Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps units.

S. 646

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 646, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require a full military honors ceremony for certain deceased veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 747

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 747, a bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, and for other purposes.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 867

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 867, a bill to protect students of institutions of higher education and the taxpayer investment in institutions of higher education by improving oversight and accountability of institutions of higher education, particularly for-profit colleges, improving protections for students and borrowers, and ensuring the integrity of postsecondary education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 970

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 970, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain re-

visions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes.

S. 1026

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1026, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran.

S. 1044

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1044, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids, and for other purposes.

S. 1049

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1098

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1098, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve the transportation alternatives program, and for other purposes.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to promote security and energy partnerships in the Eastern Mediterranean, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 1142

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont

(Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 1173

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1173, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1191

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1191, a bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1315

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1315, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes.

S. 1414

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to provide bankruptcy relief for student borrowers.

S. 1514

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1514, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education that participate in programs under such title to distribute voter registration forms to students enrolled at the institution, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the Transition Assistance Program for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1565

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1565, a bill to establish a Corps of Engineers Flood Control Civilian Advisory Council, and for other purposes.

S. 1642

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, a bill to increase the recruitment and retention of school-based mental health services providers by low-income local educational agencies.

S. 1667

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1667, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain scholarships as earned income for purposes of the kiddie tax.

S. 1677

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1677, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to postpone certain deadlines by reason of State declared disasters or emergencies.

S. 1687

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1687, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for certain casualty losses of uncut timber.

S. 1712

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. MENENDEZ) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1712, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of DISARM antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1712, *supra*.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission.

S. RES. 142

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 142, a resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima, calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 217, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 7 through June 9, 2019, as “National Gun Violence Awareness Weekend” and June 2019 as “National Gun Violence Awareness Month”

S. RES. 221

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 221, a resolution recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre and condemning the intensifying repression and human rights violations by the Chinese Communist Party and the use of surveillance by Chinese authorities, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1722. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize State-licensed appraisers to conduct appraisals in connection with mortgages insured by the FHA and to ensure compliance with the existing appraiser education and competency requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1722

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “FHA Appraiser Eligibility Expansion Act”.

#### SEC. 2. APPRAISER STANDARDS.

(a) CERTIFICATION OR LICENSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(g)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) be certified or licensed by the State in which the property to be appraised is located;

“(B) be knowledgeable of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice and the appraisal requirements established by the Federal Housing Administration;

“(C) meet the competency requirements described in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice before accepting an assignment; and

“(D) have demonstrated verifiable education in the appraisal requirements established by the Federal Housing Administration under this subsection, which shall include the completion of a course or seminar that educates appraisers on those appraisal requirements and is provided by the Federal Housing Administration or is approved by the Course Approval Program of the Appraiser Qualification Board of the Appraisal Foundation or a State appraiser certifying and licensing agency.”.

(2) APPLICATION.—Subparagraph (D) of section 202(g)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)), as added by paragraph (1), shall not apply with respect to any appraiser approved by the Federal Housing Administration to conduct appraisals on mortgages insured under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) on or before the date on which the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations take effect under subsection (c)(3).

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH VERIFIABLE EDUCATION AND COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Effective beginning on the date on which the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations take effect under subsection (c)(3), no appraiser may conduct an appraisal for any mortgage insured under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) unless—

(1) the appraiser is in compliance with the requirements under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) section 202(g)(5) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)), as amended by subsection (a); and

(2) if the appraiser was not approved to conduct such appraisals before the date on which the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations take effect under subsection (c)(3), the appraiser is in compliance with subparagraph (D) of such section 202(g)(5).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than the 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue a mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations that shall—

(1) implement the amendments made by subsection (a);

(2) clearly set forth all of the specific requirements under section 202(g)(5) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1708(g)(5)), as amended by this Act, for approval to conduct appraisals under title II of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.), which shall include—

(A) providing that, before the effective date of the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations, a demonstration of competency and completion of training that meet the requirements under subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of such section 202(g)(5), as amended by subsection (a), shall be considered to fulfill the requirements under such subparagraphs; and

(B) providing a method for appraisers to demonstrate such prior competency and completion; and

(3) take effect not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Secretary issues the mortgagee letter or other guidance or regulations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1733. A bill to limit the separation of children from their parents or legal guardians, to limit the detention of families and children, to provide unaccompanied alien children with access to counsel, to increase the number of immigration judges and support staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will address one of the most pressing immigration problems facing our nation.

For the past decade, thousands of families have fled violence and poverty to seek asylum in the United States. These families include vulnerable children who must be kept safe once they arrive in the United States. However, since the beginning of the Trump Administration, several new policies have been implemented.

Most disconcerting is the Trump policy to separate young children, even babies, from their mothers and fathers. Dozens of these children spent days and weeks in cages with nothing but thin mats and aluminum blankets.

We have also learned that the Trump Administration then deported many of these parents, leaving the children to be orphaned in this country. In fact, hundreds of children who were separated under this policy have now been apart from their parents for many months, without any immediate prospects for reunification. These children continue to experience extreme stress that leaves them vulnerable to serious, lifelong mental and physical health problems.

Even when families are reunified after months apart, some children no longer recognize the mothers and fathers. This is unconscionable. Today I am introducing the Protecting Immigrant Families and Improving Immigration Procedures Act, a bill that will not only end the practice of separating families at the border, but also put in place other safeguards to protect these at-risk groups.

The first component of the bill I am introducing today is the full text of the Keep Families Together Act, a bill I introduced earlier this year to halt the separation of families and which currently has more than 40 cosponsors. The President claimed to end his policy of separation in June 2018. However, we have since learned that the practice of separating families continues today.

In fact, the Inspector General for Health and Human Services found that thousands more children were separated than the administration initially

revealed in June. Parents who try to protect their children from violence and poverty abroad should not be punished by having those children ripped from their arms. Children should not be subjected to severe trauma in the interest of deterring migration.

Instead, families should be kept together and given an opportunity to present their cases for asylum as has been done for the past seven decades.

The second part of the bill I'm introducing today ensures that families with children are not forced into prolonged, indefinite family detention in order to remain together. Child welfare experts, including the American Academy of Pediatrics and the United Nations, have found that detention of this sort has tremendous negative effects on children's health and welfare. This bill guarantees that the Trump Administration cannot reverse the crucial protections that are currently in place under the Flores settlement agreement.

The third piece of this bill would help address the backlog in our immigration courts while protecting the basic rights of children. This part of the bill contains provisions to provide adequate resources to our immigration court system. By adding additional judges and staff, courts will be able to reduce the crushing backlog of over a million pending deportation cases.

The fourth component of this legislation is Senator HIRONO's bill, the Fair Day in Court for Kids Act, that provides counsel for unaccompanied children. This is meant to ensure that these children receive a meaningful opportunity to present their cases in immigration court. This is important because young children, including toddlers, have been forced to represent themselves in immigration court in recent years. It is simply impossible for children to understand their legal immigration status or rights, let alone explain it to a judge.

This bill protects the most vulnerable children in by providing counsel when there is no parent or legal guardian available. The final part of the bill will ensure that immigration judges can manage their caseloads and prioritize the cases as needed. Currently, individuals in deportation proceedings who have been victims of human trafficking or have assisted with criminal prosecutions are often eligible for visas that would protect them from deportation. This bill would allow immigration judges to close these deportation cases quickly to protect these vulnerable individuals and conserve scarce courtroom time. This will be a crucial step in clearing the backlog of pending immigration cases.

By taking these steps, we will help put our immigration system on a pathway to respect the basic rights of children, particularly those who are fleeing violence and poverty abroad. These children are some of the most vulnerable people in the world, and it is absolutely essential that our legal system

should treat them with fairness and respect.

These are goals that should be appealing to Democrats and Republicans alike. I hope my colleagues will join me in passing the Protecting Immigrant Families and Improving Immigration Procedures Act.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1733

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Families and Improving Immigration Procedures Act".

#### SEC. 2. ENSURING THAT FAMILIES REMAIN TOGETHER.

(a) LIMITATION ON THE SEPARATION OF FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An agent or officer of a designated agency shall not remove a child from his or her parent or legal guardian at or near the port of entry or within 100 miles of the border of the United States unless 1 of the following situations has occurred:

(A) A State court, authorized under State law—

(i) terminates the rights of a parent or legal guardian;

(ii) determines that it is in the best interests of the child to be removed from his or her parent or legal guardian, in accordance with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-89); or

(iii) makes any similar determination that is legally authorized under State law.

(B) An official from the State or county child welfare agency with expertise in child trauma and development determines that it is in the best interests of the child to be removed from his or her parent or legal guardian because the child—

(i) is in danger of abuse or neglect at the hands of the parent or legal guardian; or

(ii) is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

(C) The Chief Patrol Agent or the Area Port Director, in his or her official and undelegated capacity, authorizes separation, upon the recommendation by an agent or officer, based on a finding that—

(i) the child is a victim of trafficking or is at significant risk of becoming a victim of trafficking;

(ii) there is a strong likelihood that the adult is not the parent or legal guardian of the child; or

(iii) the child is in danger of abuse or neglect at the hands of the parent or legal guardian, or is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

(2) PROHIBITION ON SEPARATION.—An agency may not remove a child from a parent or legal guardian solely for the policy goal of deterring individuals from migrating to the United States or for the policy goal of promoting compliance with civil immigration laws.

(3) DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall ensure that a separation based upon a situation described in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) is documented in writing; and

(B) includes the reason for such separation and the stated evidence for such separation.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SEPARATION BY AGENTS OR OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop training and guidance, with an emphasis on the best interests of the child, childhood trauma, attachment, and child development, for use by the agents and officers, in order to standardize separations authorized under subsection (a)(1)(C).

(2) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) review the guidance developed under paragraph (1); and

(B) make recommendations to the Secretary to ensure that such guidance conforms to current evidence and best practices in child welfare, child development, and childhood trauma.

(3) **REQUIREMENT.**—The guidance developed under paragraph (1) shall incorporate the presumptions described in subsection (c).

(4) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **EVIDENCE-BASED.**—The guidance and training developed under this subsection shall incorporate evidence-based practices.

(B) **TRAINING REQUIRED.**—

(i) **INITIAL TRAINING.**—All agents and officers of designated agencies, upon hire, and annually thereafter, shall complete training on adherence to the guidance under this subsection.

(ii) **ANNUAL TRAINING.**—All Chief Patrol Agents and Area Port Directors, upon hire, and annually thereafter, shall complete—

(I) training on adherence to the guidance under this subsection; and

(II) 90 minutes of child welfare practice training that is evidence-based and trauma-informed.

(c) **PRESUMPTIONS.**—The presumptions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) **FAMILY UNITY.**—There shall be a strong presumption in favor of family unity.

(2) **SIBLINGS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that sibling groups remain intact.

(3) **DETENTION.**—There is a presumption that detention is not in the best interests of families and children.

(d) **REQUIRED POLICY FOR LOCATING SEPARATED CHILDREN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish final public guidance that describes, with specificity, the manner in which a parent or legal guardian may locate a child who was separated from the parent or legal guardian under subsection (a)(1). In developing the public guidance, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, immigrant advocacy organizations, child welfare organizations, and State child welfare agencies.

(2) **WRITTEN NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall provide each parent or legal guardian who was separated, with written notice of the public guidance to locate a separated child.

(3) **LANGUAGE ACCESS.**—All guidance shall be available in English and Spanish, and at the request of the parent or legal guardian, in the language or manner that is understandable by the parent or legal guardian.

(e) **REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR SEPARATED FAMILIES.**—Not less frequently than monthly, the Secretary shall provide the parent or legal guardian of a child who was separated—

(1) a status report on the monthly activities of the child;

(2) information about the education and health of the child, including any medical treatment provided to the child or medical treatment recommended for the child;

(3) information about changes to the child's immigration status; and

(4) other information about the child, designed to promote and maintain family re-

unification, as the Secretary determines in his or her discretion.

(f) **ANNUAL REPORT ON FAMILY SEPARATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the committees of jurisdiction that describes each instance in which a child was separated from a parent or legal guardian and includes, for each such instance—

(1) the relationship of the adult and the child;

(2) the age and gender of the adult and child;

(3) the length of separation;

(4) whether the adult was charged with a crime, and if the adult was charged with a crime, the type of crime;

(5) whether the adult made a claim for asylum, expressed a fear to return, or applied for other immigration relief;

(6) whether the adult was prosecuted if charged with a crime and the associated outcome of such charges;

(7) the stated reason for, and evidence in support of, the separation;

(8) if the child was part of a sibling group at the time of separation, whether the sibling group has had physical contact and visitation;

(9) whether the child was rendered an unaccompanied alien child; and

(10) other information in the Secretary's discretion.

(g) **CLARIFICATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS.**—If a child is separated from a parent or legal guardian, and a State court has not made a determination that the parental rights have been terminated, there is a presumption that—

(1) the parental rights remain intact; and

(2) the separation does not constitute an affirmative determination of abuse or neglect under Federal or State law.

(h) **CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING LAW.**—

(1) **FEDERAL LAW.**—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to supersede or modify Federal child welfare law, where applicable, including the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-89).

(2) **STATE LAW.**—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to supersede or modify State child welfare laws, as applicable.

(i) **GAO REPORT ON PROSECUTION OF ASYLUM SEEKERS.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the prosecution of asylum seekers during the period beginning on January 1, 2008 and ending on December 31, 2018, including—

(A) the total number of persons who claimed a fear of persecution, received a favorable credible fear determination, and were referred for prosecution;

(B) an overview and analysis of the metrics used by the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to track the number of asylum seekers referred for prosecution;

(C) the total number of asylum seekers referred for prosecution, a breakdown and description of the criminal charges filed against asylum seekers during such period, and a breakdown and description of the convictions secured;

(D) the total number of asylum seekers who were separated from their children as a result of being referred for prosecution;

(E) a breakdown of the resources spent on prosecuting asylum seekers during such period, as well as any diversion of resources required to prosecute asylum seekers, and any costs imposed on States and localities;

(F) the total number of asylum seekers who were referred for prosecution and also went through immigration proceedings; and

(G) the total number of asylum seekers referred for prosecution who were deported before going through immigration proceedings.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress that describes the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

### SEC. 3. FLORES SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A family unit may be detained only in accordance with the holding made in *Flores v. Sessions et al.* (9th Cir. July 5, 2017; C.D. CA; July 24, 2015)) and the stipulated settlement agreement as filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California on January 17, 1997 (CV 85 4544 RJK) (commonly known as the “Flores settlement agreement”).

(b) **RULEMAKING.**—Any regulation proposed or promulgated to supersede the Flores settlement agreement is null and void.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(1) to affect the application of the Flores settlement agreement to unaccompanied alien children; or

(2) to abrogate the Flores settlement agreement.

(d) **REVIEW OF DETENTION DETERMINATIONS.**—The review of any determination by the Secretary to detain an individual or family unit under this section shall be in accordance with all other provisions of law, holdings (including any holding made in *Flores v. Sessions et al.* (9th Cir. July 5, 2017; C.D. CA. July 24, 2015)), consent decrees, and settlement agreements (including the Flores settlement agreement).

### SEC. 4. ACCESS TO COUNSEL FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) **APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL.**—In any removal proceeding and in any appeal proceeding before the Attorney General from any such removal proceeding, an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act on 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) shall be represented by Government-appointed counsel, at Government expense.

(b) **LENGTH OF REPRESENTATION.**—Once a child is designated as an unaccompanied alien child under subsection (a)—

(1) the child shall be represented by counsel at every stage of the proceedings from the child's initial appearance through the termination of immigration proceedings; and

(2) any ancillary matters appropriate to such proceedings even if the child reaches 18 years of age or is reunified with a parent or legal guardian while the proceedings are pending.

(c) **NOTICE.**—Not later than 72 hours after an unaccompanied alien child is taken into Federal custody, the child shall be notified that he or she will be provided with legal counsel in accordance with this section.

(d) **WITHIN DETENTION FACILITIES.**—The Secretary shall ensure that unaccompanied alien children have access to counsel inside all detention, holding, and border facilities.

(e) **PRO BONO REPRESENTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Attorney General should make every effort to utilize the services of competent counsel who agree to provide representation to such children under this section without charge.

(2) **DEVELOPMENT OF NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS.**—The Attorney General shall develop the necessary mechanisms—

(A) to identify counsel available to provide pro bono legal assistance and representation to children under this section; and

(B) to recruit such counsel.

(f) **CONTRACTS; GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may enter into contracts with, or award



grants to, nonprofit agencies with relevant expertise in the delivery of immigration-related legal services to children to carry out the responsibilities under this section, including providing legal orientation, screening cases for referral, recruiting, training, and overseeing pro bono attorneys.

(2) **SUBCONTRACTS.**—Nonprofit agencies may enter into subcontracts with, or award grants to, private voluntary agencies with relevant expertise in the delivery of immigration related legal services to children in order to carry out this section.

(g) **MODEL GUIDELINES ON LEGAL REPRESENTATION OF CHILDREN.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES.**—The Executive Office for Immigration Review, in consultation with voluntary agencies and national experts, shall develop model guidelines for the legal representation of alien children in immigration proceedings, which shall be based on the children's asylum guidelines, the American Bar Association Model Rules of Professional Conduct, and other relevant domestic or international sources.

(2) **PURPOSE OF GUIDELINES.**—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall be designed to help protect each child from any individual suspected of involvement in any criminal, harmful, or exploitative activity associated with the smuggling or trafficking of children, while ensuring the fairness of the removal proceeding in which the child is involved.

(h) **DUTIES OF COUNSEL.**—Counsel provided under this section shall—

(1) represent the unaccompanied alien child in all proceedings and matters relating to the immigration status of the child or other actions involving the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) appear in person for all individual merits hearings before the Executive Office for Immigration Review and interviews involving the Department of Homeland Security;

(3) owe the same duties of undivided loyalty, confidentiality, and competent representation to the child as is due to an adult client; and

(4) carry out other such duties as may be proscribed by the Attorney General or the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

#### **SEC. 5. INCREASES IN IMMIGRATION JUDGES AND SUPPORT STAFF.**

(a) **IMMIGRATION JUDGES.**—The Attorney General shall increase the total number of immigration judges to adjudicate pending cases and efficiently process future cases by not fewer than 75 judges during fiscal year 2019.

(b) **SUPPORT STAFF.**—The Attorney General shall—

(1) increase the total number of judicial law clerks by 75 during fiscal year 2019; and

(2) increase the total number of support staff for immigration judges, including legal assistants and interpreters, by 300 during fiscal year 2019.

#### **SEC. 6. DOCKET MANAGEMENT FOR RESOURCE CONSERVATION.**

Notwithstanding any opposition from the Secretary, immigration judges may administratively close cases, and the Board of Immigration Appeals may remand cases for administrative closure, if an individual in removal proceedings—

(1) appears to be prima facie eligible for a visa or other immigration benefit; and

(2) has a pending application for such benefit before U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services or another appropriate agency.

#### **SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **AGENT; OFFICER.**—The terms “agent” and “officer” include contractors of the Federal Government.

(2) **CHILD.**—The term “child” means an individual who—

(A) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(B) has no permanent immigration status.

(3) **COMMITTEES OF JURISDICTION.**—The term “committees of jurisdiction” means—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(4) **DANGER OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT AT THE HANDS OF THE PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN.**—The term “danger of abuse or neglect at the hands of the parent or legal guardian” shall not mean migrating to or crossing the United States border.

(5) **DESIGNATED AGENCY.**—The term “designated agency” means—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) the Department of Justice; and

(C) the Department of Health and Human Services.

(6) **FINDING.**—The term “finding” means an individualized written assessment or screening by the trained agent or officer that includes a consultation with a child welfare specialist, formalized as required under subsection (b)(3) and consistent with subsections (c), (d), and (h).

(7) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 1734. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the District of Columbia to receive Federal funding under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I am once again introducing legislation to allow the District of Columbia to receive funding and other benefits under the Coastal Zone Management Act. I am pleased to offer this companion legislation to a bill, H.R. 2185, introduced by the Congresswoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Few of us realize that 70 percent of the District is located within the coastal plain. Similar to my State of Delaware, sea level rise, upstream sources of water, degraded infrastructure, and coastal subsidence mean that the District could experience serious future cleanup and repair costs due to flooding—including damage to federal property, which makes up almost 30 percent of the District. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) reports that since 1950, nuisance flooding has increased by more than 300% in the District. And, since 2006, DC has experienced two 100-year flooding events, and District officials estimate that a future 100-year flood event could cause over \$1.2 billion in damages. Needless to say, these events will become more and more common due to climate change—including rising sea levels—and coastal subsidence.

The District of Columbia would use funding from the Coastal Zone Management Program for flood risk planning and environmental restoration to prevent and mitigate future flood damage. At the same time, this work would help

to restore and conserve the District's coastal resources such as habitat, fisheries, and endangered species.

If included in the Coastal Zone Management Program, the District of Columbia would be eligible for \$1 million or more of federal funding annually to assist in coastal flood-control projects, to combat non-point source water pollution, and to develop special area management plans in areas experiencing environmental justice and/or flooding issues.

The National Coastal Zone Management Program, housed in NOAA, was established through the passage of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. At the time, Congress recognized the need to manage the effects of increased growth in the nation's coastal zone, which includes jurisdictions bordering the oceans and the Great Lakes.

There are currently 34 jurisdictional coastal zone management programs, including both States and territories. In order for the District of Columbia to participate in the program, Congress must pass this amendment to the Coastal Zone Management Act that would include the District under the definition of a “coastal state.”

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1734

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Flood Prevention Act of 2019”.

#### **SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR FEDERAL FUNDING UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1972.**

Section 304(4) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453(4)) is amended by inserting “the District of Columbia,” after “the term also includes”.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1741. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a set of three bills that will lower the cost of energy storage, increase flexibility in the power grid, and create a comprehensive set of grant programs to advance development of renewable energy technologies throughout the country.

Currently, many energy technologies—like energy storage—compete in unfair markets, making it hard for new innovations to measure up to more established technologies like those of the fossil fuel industry. Congress and the Department of Energy



can work hand-in-hand with industry to level the playing field, using a fair, tech-neutral approach when updating the electricity system, to benefit the American consumer.

My Reducing the Cost of Energy Storage Act will provide funding to the Department of Energy to research and develop ways to lower the cost of energy storage technologies. Ultimately, this bill will make it possible for renewable energy to be used on a more reliable and affordable basis.

To protect the power supply from disruptions caused by natural disasters, which can wipe out power to millions of homes, my Flexible Grid Infrastructure Act will require the Department of Energy to find and develop ways to make the power grid more flexible and responsive to these challenges. The bill will also connect displaced workers to training programs that will allow them to transition to high-skill clean energy jobs. Finally, this bill will provide States and utilities with resources to upgrade the flexibility and reliability of the power grid.

In order to ensure private sector growth in distributed energy technologies, my Distributed Energy Demonstration Act will create competitive, cost-share grant programs for new small-scale, grid-connected projects, such as rooftop solar panels, hot water heaters, electric vehicles, and modernized utility pricing technologies.

Together or apart, these bills will promote a more flexible electricity grid that can respond to power disruptions from natural disasters and ensure reliable, low-cost electricity for consumers now and in the future. They will also lower costs for energy storage technologies that make renewable energy more reliable and cost-effective, boost funding for cutting-edge research, and reward State and private sector innovations, which will make renewable energy more reliable and affordable for U.S. energy consumers.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1744. A bill to provide lawful permanent resident status for certain advanced STEM degree holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1744

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Keep STEM Talent Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ADVANCED STEM DEGREE HOLDERS.

(a) ALIENS NOT SUBJECT TO DIRECT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 201(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.

1151(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F)(i) Aliens who—

“(I) have earned a degree in a STEM field at the master’s level or higher while physically present in the United States from a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) accredited by an accrediting entity recognized by the Department of Education;

“(II) have an offer of employment from, or are employed by, a United States employer in a field related to such degree at a rate of pay that is higher than the median wage level for the occupational classification in the area of employment, as determined by the Secretary of Labor; and

“(III) are admissible pursuant to an approved labor certification under section 212(a)(5)(A)(i).

“(ii) In this subparagraph, the term ‘STEM field’ means a field of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics described in the most recent version of the Classification of Instructional Programs of the Department of Education taxonomy under the summary group of—

“(I) computer and information sciences and support services;

“(II) engineering;

“(III) mathematics and statistics;

“(IV) biological and biomedical sciences;

“(V) physical sciences;

“(VI) agriculture sciences; or

“(VII) natural resources and conservation sciences.”.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRATION STATUS.—Section 204(a)(1)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(F)) is amended—

(1) by striking “203(b)(2)” and all that follows through “Attorney General”; and

(2) by inserting “203(b)(2), 203(b)(3), or 201(b)(1)(F) may file a petition with the Secretary of Homeland Security”.

(c) DUAL INTENT FOR F NONIMMIGRANTS SEEKING ADVANCED STEM DEGREES AT UNITED STATES INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding sections 101(a)(15)(F)(i) and 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(F)(i), 1184(b)), an alien who is a bona fide student admitted to a program in a STEM field (as defined in section 201(b)(1)(F)(ii)) for a degree at the master’s level or higher at a United States institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))) accredited by an accrediting entity recognized by the Department of Education may obtain a student visa or extend or change nonimmigrant status to pursue such degree even if such alien intends to seek lawful permanent resident status in the United States.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1749. A bill to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 1749

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. SEASONING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN REFINANCED MORTGAGE LOANS.

(a) GINNIE MAE.—Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) VETERANS LOANS.—Section 3709(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “is refinanced” and inserting “is a refinance”; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) the date on which the borrower has made at least six consecutive monthly payments on the loan being refinanced; and

“(2) the date that is 210 days after the first payment due date of the loan being refinanced.”.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to restrict or otherwise modify the authorities of the Government National Mortgage Association.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1753. A bill to promote accountability and effective administration in the execution of laws by restoring the original understanding of the President’s constitutional power to remove subordinates from office; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, President Trump was famous for many things even before he was elected. One of those things was the catchphrase “You’re fired,” which he popularized on his reality TV show “The Apprentice.”

This is a relatively commonplace phrase. It is something that most persons are familiar with, but it is not surprising that the phrase would have so much appeal for a television audience. I think the reason has something to do with the fact that it carries a certain power and resonance with it because the person who has the authority to use it within any organization is, generally speaking, a person who gets to call the shots. It is emblematic of executive control and, therefore, the ability to get things done within an organization.

That is not to say that good leaders get their way solely or even primarily by threatening to fire people who work for them. Effective leadership, more often than not, requires what are sometimes called soft leadership skills.

But the fact, nonetheless, remains that the head of an organization must always have hanging in reserve, sort of like an employer Damoclean sword—the absolute right to terminate a subordinate.

It is the ultimate and essential backstop that enforces and reifies an executive’s power to make decisions. This is true for pretty much any leader, whether that leader happens to be the CEO of a corporation, the coach of a sports team, or a general out on the field of battle.

Yet, remarkably, under our laws, the President of the United States lacks authority over many high-ranking officers within the executive branch. Despite its elemental association with Executive power, Congress and the courts have time and again deprived the President of the ability to remove his subordinates at will.

These restrictions often take the form of statutory for-cause removal

protections, such as the provision of the Federal Trade Commission Act that provides that Commissioners may be removed only “for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.”

In enacting laws like this, Congress has cast aside the original meaning of the Constitution and thereby eroded a critical safeguard of American freedom. As anyone who has studied the Constitution or constitutional law, for that matter, can guess, my reference to the FTC’s for-cause protection is not accidental.

That statute formed the basis of the lawsuit that culminated in the 1935 decision by the Supreme Court in a case called *Humphrey’s Executor*, in which the Supreme Court held for the first time that Congress may impose restrictions on the President’s removal power.

In so holding, the Supreme Court overruled its earlier precedent in *Myers v. United States*, which had held that Congress may not limit the President’s ability to remove principal officers within the Federal Government, but *Humphrey’s Executor* didn’t simply overrule *Myers*. Rather, as Justice Scalia later wrote, “it gutt[ed], in six quick pages devoid of textual or historical precedent. . . . a carefully researched and reasoned 70-page opinion.” That juxtaposition alone tells you what you need to know about these decisions. One had constitutional text and original understanding and historical precedent behind it. The other was constitutional law by judicial fiat.

Article II of the Constitution unquestionably establishes a unitary executive. The vesting clause provides that “the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.”

As Alexander Hamilton explained it in *Federalist No. 70*, placing the totality of the Executive power in a single individual was no happenstance. It was no mistake. It wasn’t just sort of some fluke. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention recognized that a unified executive was essential to ensure energy and accountability in the execution of the laws, and the Constitution was drafted accordingly, consistent with this understanding.

Without the authority to supervise and direct, and, yes, ultimately fire his subordinates, it is impossible for the President to fulfill his duty imposed by article II to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.”

The Founders also understood that the President’s removal power was the bedrock of his authority to oversee the executive branch. In a famous debate during the First Congress, James Madison argued that “if any power whatsoever is in its nature Executive, it is the power of appointing, overseeing, and controlling those who execute the laws.”

He went on to note that “if the President should possess alone the power of removal from office, those who are em-

ployed in the execution of the law will be in their proper situation, and the chain of dependence be preserved; [they] will depend, as they ought, on the President, and the President on the community.”

Madison’s argument prevailed, and the First Congress declined, on constitutional grounds, for the reasons articulated by James Madison himself, to create for-cause removal protections for the heads of the newly established executive branch departments. They considered it; Madison raised, very persuasively, this constitutional argument against it; and then they voted it down. That was the original understanding of the removal power, and it predominated for nearly 150 years after the Founding.

Since *Humphrey’s Executor* and its radical departure from the original understanding in 1935, for-cause removal protections, both statutory and otherwise, have, sadly, proliferated, giving rise to a vast, headless, out-of-control branch of government, a fourth branch of government, if you will, that exists beyond the control of the President and is therefore unaccountable to the people.

In fact, by some estimations, there are over 80 so-called independent agencies within the executive branch. These executive branch agencies that we refer to somehow as independent are entrusted with regulating immense swaths of American life—from competition policy and workplace safety regulations to labor relations and even securities laws. They make rules; they adjudicate rights; and they enforce laws. The potential for abuse is tremendous; the inconsistency with the republican principles this country was founded on, obvious.

Now, there are a lot of people here who like the sound of the term “independent agency,” and they might suppose, incorrectly, that an agency that is independent, that is beyond the control of the President of the United States to oversee, that that is somehow a good thing.

On closer inspection, we discover that quite the opposite is true. When we insulate someone from Presidential oversight, what we are doing is taking the American people out of the picture. There is a reason why we have elections every 4 years, and those elections focus on the election of a President. It is so there is some chain of accountability between the people and the executive branch of government.

That has become more important, not less, over the last few decades as we have created more and more executive branch agencies and we have entrusted those agencies with more and more power. It has never been more important than it is today to make sure the people are connected. If you disconnect the American people by insulating them from the political process, then you have a whole group of people who these days are charged not just with administering the laws but, in

some cases, with effectively making it and interpreting it, and you are taking them beyond the supervision that would otherwise be appropriate by the President of the United States within the executive branch of government.

In their fight against British tyranny, the Patriots of the American Revolution rallied behind the principle of “no taxation without representation.” Today we are faced with a somewhat different threat to freedom, as Chief Justice Roberts wrote in a case just a few years ago. “The growth of the Executive Branch, which now wields vast power and touches almost every aspect of daily life, heightens the concern that it may slip from the Executive’s control, and thus from that of the people.”

In other words, as Chief Justice Roberts explained, when you take this power away from the President, you are taking it away from the people. The people lose their input on and their control over these very important functions of what is appropriately described as the people’s government.

The concern is further compounded by the existence of independent agencies that are, by law, divorced from any Presidential control. As a result, in this new fight against tyranny, our watchword perhaps must be “no regulation without representation.” That is why I have spearheaded the Article I Project and why I supported legislation such as the REINS Act and the Separation of Powers Restoration Act that would bring the Federal regulatory apparatus, as we know it, to heel.

Of course, more is needed. We need to not only reform Congress’s relationship with the administrative state but the President’s as well. To that end, I am introducing new legislation called the Take Care Act. The bill would restore the unitary executive envisioned by the Founders and, in fact, required by the Constitution by stripping away all existing for-cause removal protections from the so-called independent agencies. It would also limit Congress’s ability to create for-cause protections by implication in the future and take other critical steps to fortify the President’s directive authority.

Simply put, the Take Care Act would eliminate the headless fourth branch of government, empower the President to ensure faithful execution of the law, and make the bureaucracy accountable to the people again. Importantly, the Take Care Act would not cause the work of administrative agencies to become subject to the unmitigated whims and caprices of a President. There is still very real, very meaningful political constraints, including the Senate’s advise and consent role, that would ensure, as they do now, in areas outside of these so-called independent agencies, that the executive officers can fulfill their congressionally assigned duties without undue interference.

In other words, although there are some so-called independent agencies as to which the President has no removal

power, there are a whole lot that are not. The President's Cabinet and many other positions within the Federal Government involve people who are appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and who serve at the pleasure of the President who can be fired at any moment for any reason the President might deem appropriate.

Nevertheless, that does not mean that Presidents go around just firing people arbitrarily because Presidents understand that there is a political cost to doing that. We have seen in recent years, and we have seen earlier in American history, how Presidents, even when they have disagreements with members of their Cabinet or other people who serve at the pleasure of the President—Presidents are still reluctant to fire people because there are political costs attached to that, and especially where Congress perceives there might be a partisan political motive in mind, Congress may well take action.

In the case of the Senate, it almost inevitably will at least threaten, if not carry out the threat, to hold up future confirmations of Presidential appointments if Presidents abuse this power.

So it simply isn't true to say that this would open the floodgates and cause all Presidents to just fire people arbitrarily without hesitation in the future. What it would mean is that our elected President would have the power to represent the people and to oversee the executive branch of the Federal Government just as article II already requires.

So all this bill would do would be to rescind and limit unconstitutional restrictions on the President's removal power, and while it may be more convenient to limit this power by statute, convenience and efficiency are not the primary objectives or the hallmarks of a democratic government, as the Supreme Court has repeatedly reminded us.

Another famous catchphrase popularized by an American President is "the buck stops here," which President Truman, of course, displayed on a placard on his desk in the Oval Office at the White House during his Presidency. What it means is, the President is the final decision maker within the executive branch, and, therefore, bears the sole and ultimate responsibility for executing the laws.

In order to fulfill that very special, sacred, important responsibility, the President must have plenary power to direct the President's subordinates in how they carry out their assigned tasks and, if necessary, fire them. That is what the Constitution and, indeed, common sense require. By restoring the original understanding and restoring the removal power to the Presidency, the Take Care Act would give the President this authority.

By taking this step, we would re-empower the American people with that which is rightfully theirs to begin with.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 231—CONDEMNING THE HORRIFIC ANTI-SEMITIC ATTACK ON THE CHABAD OF POWAY SYNAGOGUE NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, ON APRIL 27, 2019

Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 231

Whereas on April 27, 2019, a 19-year-old armed with an assault rifle attacked the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, while congregants were celebrating the last day of the Passover holiday;

Whereas the gunman wounded Almog Peretz, Noya Dahan, and Rabbi Yisroel Goldstein;

Whereas Lori Gilbert Kaye, a founding member of the congregation, was killed while bravely saving the life of Rabbi Goldstein;

Whereas, in describing the attack, Rabbi Goldstein said—

(1) "... Lori took the bullet for all of us. She died to protect all of us"; and

(2) "This is Lori. This is her legacy, and her legacy will continue. It could have been so much worse.";

Whereas Oscar Stewart, a veteran of the Army, and Jonathan Morales, a border patrol agent, bravely fought back, running toward the perpetrator of the attack;

Whereas law enforcement and first responders, including the San Diego Sheriff's Department, acted quickly and professionally to respond to the attack and care for the victims;

Whereas the perpetrator of the attack, who expressed White supremacist and White nationalist sentiments, entered the synagogue shouting anti-Semitic slurs;

Whereas the attack occurred 6 months to the day after the attack on the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, which killed 11 innocent people and injured 6 others, including 4 law enforcement officers;

Whereas anti-Semitism is an age-old form of prejudice, discrimination, persecution, and marginalization of Jewish people that runs counter to the values of the United States;

Whereas, according to an annual audit conducted by the Anti-Defamation League, in 2018—

(1) anti-Semitic incidents remained at near-historic levels in the United States; and

(2) the number of anti-Semitic incidents with known connections to extremists or inspired by extremist ideology reached the highest levels since 2004;

Whereas, in a manifesto attributed to the perpetrator of the attack, the perpetrator of the attack claimed responsibility for the burning of a mosque in Escondido, California, and demonstrated anti-Muslim bias;

Whereas growing White supremacy and White nationalism is—

(1) a threat to the security of the United States; and

(2) antithetical to the American values of dignity and respect of all people, including Jewish, Muslim, Black, Latino, Asian American, immigrant, and LGBTQ peoples; and

Whereas hate has no place in the United States and there is a duty to condemn all forms of hatred: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the horrific anti-Semitic attack on the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, on April 27, 2019,

which killed 1 individual and injured 3 others;

(2) honors the memory of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who was killed in the attack;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery for the individuals injured in the attack;

(4) offers heartfelt condolences to—

(A) the Chabad of Poway congregation;

(B) the San Diego area Jewish community; and

(C) the friends and family of those individuals affected by the tragedy;

(5) recognizes the dedicated service of the law enforcement emergency response officials and medical professionals who responded to the attack and cared for the victims; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to condemn—

(A) anti-Semitism;

(B) White supremacy;

(C) White nationalism; and

(D) all forms of hatred.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 232—CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE EXTRADITION OR EXPULSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CONVICTED FELONS JOANNE CHESIMARD AND WILLIAM MORALES AND ALL OTHER FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE WHO ARE RECEIVING SAFE HAVEN IN CUBA IN ORDER TO ESCAPE PROSECUTION OR CONFINEMENT FOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES COMMITTED IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 232

Whereas Joanne Chesimard, one of the most wanted terrorists of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was convicted of the May 2, 1973, murder of New Jersey State Trooper Werner Foerster;

Whereas William Morales, leader and chief bomb-maker for the terrorist organization Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional, committed numerous terrorist attacks on United States soil, including the bombings of Fraunces Tavern in lower Manhattan on January 25, 1975, and the Mobil Oil employment office in New York on August 3, 1977, which killed 5 people and injured over 60 others;

Whereas more than 70 fugitives from the United States, charged with offenses ranging from hijacking to kidnapping to drug offenses to murder, are believed to be receiving safe haven in Cuba;

Whereas other fugitives from United States justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba include Charles Hill, wanted for the killing of a State trooper in New Mexico, and Victor Manuel Gerena, on the list of the 10 most wanted fugitives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for carrying out a brutal robbery of a Wells Fargo armored car in Connecticut;

Whereas, according to the Treaty Between the United States and Cuba for the Mutual Extradition of Fugitives from Justice, signed at Washington April 6, 1904 (33 Stat. 2265), and the Additional Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Cuba, signed at Havana, January 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 2392), the United States has a bilateral extradition treaty with Cuba;

Whereas, in January 2002, the Government of Cuba deported to the United States Jesse

James Bell, a United States fugitive wanted on drug charges;

Whereas, in March 2002, the Government of Cuba extradited drug trafficker Luis Hernando Gomez Bustamante to Colombia, and Gomez Bustamante was subsequently extradited to the United States in July 2007 to face drug trafficking charges; and

Whereas it is imperative that the Government of Cuba abide by its extradition treaty with the United States and immediately extradite or expel to the United States those legally indicted or convicted of serious criminal offenses in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) calls for the immediate extradition or expulsion to the United States of convicted felons Joanne Chesimard and William Morales and all other fugitives from justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba in order to escape prosecution or confinement for criminal offenses committed in the United States;

(2) urges the international community to continue to press for the immediate extradition or expulsion of all fugitives from justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba; and

(3) calls on the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to continue to press for the immediate extradition or expulsion from Cuba or from any other country of all fugitives from United States justice so that they may be tried and, if convicted, serve out their sentences.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 233—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING FREEDOM OF SPEECH, THOUGHT, AND EXPRESSION AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 233

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees that “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech”;

Whereas, in *Healy v. James*, 408 U.S. 169 (1972), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States applies in full force on the campuses of public colleges and universities;

Whereas, in *Widmar v. Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263 (1981), the Supreme Court of the United States observed that “the campus of a public university, at least for its students, possesses many of the characteristics of a public forum”;

Whereas lower Federal courts have also held that the open, outdoor areas of the campuses of public colleges and universities are public forums;

Whereas section 112(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011a(a)(2)) contains a sense of Congress noting that “an institution of higher education should facilitate the free and open exchange of ideas”, “students should not be intimidated, harassed, discouraged from speaking out, or discriminated against”, “students should be treated equally and fairly”, and “nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, change, or infringe upon any constitutionally protected religious liberty, freedom, expression, or association”;

Whereas, despite the clarity of the applicable legal precedent and the vital importance of protecting public colleges in the United States as true “marketplaces of ideas”, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education has found that approximately 1 in 10 of the top colleges and universities in the United States quarantine student expression to so-called “free speech zones”, and a survey of 466 schools found that almost 30 percent maintain severely restrictive speech codes that clearly and substantially prohibit constitutionally protected speech;

Whereas, according to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), “Speech codes adopted by government-financed state colleges and universities amount to government censorship, in violation of the Constitution. And the ACLU believes that all campuses should adhere to First Amendment principles because academic freedom is a bedrock of education in a free society.”;

Whereas the University of Chicago, as part of its commitment “to free and open inquiry in all matters”, issued a statement in which “it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn”, and more than 50 university administrations and faculty bodies have endorsed a version of the “Chicago Statement”;

Whereas, in December 2014, the University of Hawaii at Hilo settled a lawsuit for \$50,000 after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting students from protesting the National Security Agency unless those students were standing in the tiny, flood-prone free speech zone at the university;

Whereas, in July 2015, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, settled a lawsuit for \$35,000 after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting a student from handing out flyers about animal abuse outside of the free speech zone at the university, comprising less than 0.01 percent of campus;

Whereas, in May 2016, a student-plaintiff settled her lawsuit against Blinn College in Texas for \$50,000 after administrators told her she needed “special permission” to advocate for Second Amendment rights outside of the tiny free speech zone at the college;

Whereas, in February 2017, Georgia Gwinnett College agreed to modify its restrictive speech policies after two students sued in Federal court to challenge a requirement that students obtain prior authorization from administrators to engage in expressive activity within the limits of a tiny free speech zone, comprising less than 0.0015 percent of campus;

Whereas, in March 2017, Middlebury College students and protesters from the community prevented an invited speaker from giving his presentation and then attacked his car and assaulted a professor as the two attempted to leave, resulting in the professor suffering a concussion;

Whereas, in January 2018, Kellogg Community College in Michigan settled a lawsuit for \$55,000 for arresting two students for handing out copies of the Constitution of the United States while talking with their fellow students on a sidewalk;

Whereas, in June 2018, the University of Michigan agreed to change its restrictive speech code on the same day the United States Department of Justice filed a statement of interest in support of a lawsuit in Federal court challenging the constitutionality of the speech code of the university;

Whereas, in December 2018, the Los Angeles Community College District, a 9-campus community college district that includes Pierce College, settled a lawsuit for \$225,000 and changed its restrictive speech policies after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting a Pierce College student from distrib-

uting Spanish-language copies of the Constitution of the United States on campus unless he stood in the free speech zone, which comprised approximately 0.003 percent of the total area of the 426 acres of the college;

Whereas, in December 2018, the University of California, Berkeley, home of the 1960s campus free speech movement, settled a lawsuit for \$70,000 and changed its restrictive policies after it was sued in Federal court for singling out one student group, apart from other student groups, with the imposition of stricter rules for inviting “high-profile” public speakers;

Whereas the States of Virginia, Missouri, Arizona, Kentucky, Colorado, Utah, North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Dakota, and Iowa have passed legislation prohibiting public colleges and universities from quarantining expressive activities on the open outdoor areas of campuses to misleadingly labeled free speech zones; and

Whereas free speech zones have been used to restrict political speech from all parts of the political spectrum and have thus inhibited the free exchange of ideas at campuses across the country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that free speech zones and restrictive speech codes are inherently at odds with the freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(2) recognizes that institutions of higher education should facilitate and recommit themselves to protecting the free and open exchange of ideas;

(3) recognizes that freedom of expression and freedom of speech are sacred ideals of the United States that must be vigorously safeguarded in a world increasingly hostile to democracy;

(4) encourages the Secretary of Education to promote policies that foster spirited debate, academic freedom, intellectual curiosity, and viewpoint diversity on the campuses of public colleges and universities; and

(5) encourages the Attorney General to defend and protect the First Amendment across public colleges and universities.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is so interesting to always come to the floor and speak on topics that are important to Tennesseans and I think also to Americans. As I begin my remarks, I want to kind of build the context for this and take us back to a time I know the Presiding Officer recalls, and so do I. It was the sixties. I was a child who was growing up. I remember it as a decade where bold statements and brash behavior and activists from each side of the aisle set the standard for what we today look at and say is a modern-day political protest. What we saw in this decade was once-sleepy college campuses became the scenes of widespread unrest. Tensions were high and conditions were perfect for what else but a Supreme Court battle.

In September 1969, a group of students attending Central Connecticut State University decided they wanted to organize a local chapter of the organization Students for Democratic Society. The university president rejected the application, claiming that the SDS philosophy was “antithetical to the school’s policies” and could be a disruptive influence on campus.

Now, I am sure he thought he had a good point. The national SDS organization was known for its fiery protests,

and its now-notorious acts of civil disobedience. They made it their business to make authority figures nervous. Nervousness, however, is not an exception to the First Amendment. The students knew that, so the lawsuits started flying. The students' case finally made it to the Supreme Court, which held that "the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States applies in full force on the campuses of public colleges and universities." That case, *Healy v. James*, was a win for free speech. Although precedent continues to trend in the right direction, the First Amendment is in danger on the American college campus. From so-called free speech zones to severely restricted speech codes, campus officials are doing their best to ensure that students are protected from anything that may challenge their preexisting notions of right and wrong.

Instead of creating a safe environment, these policies have backfired, creating an atmosphere of fear and violence toward opposing viewpoints.

Just this past April, protesters at the University of Texas at Austin used smoke bombs to shut down a pro-life speaker at a Young Conservatives of Texas event.

In 2017, the editorial staff at Wellesley College's student newspaper threatened hostility toward anyone whose beliefs—their beliefs; not just their words but their beliefs—did not fit into the acceptable liberal mold.

That same year, Middlebury College campus—their left behaved so disgracefully that one progressive columnist begged the students at his alma mater to find a way to protest views they disagree with without shutting down speech entirely.

In the face of such hostility toward free and open debate, I ask this body, what have we done, and what can be done to turn back the tide?

Today, on the eve of National Higher Education Day, I am introducing the Campus Free Speech Resolution of 2019. It is a first step in restoring sanity to free speech for American college students. This resolution first and foremost recognizes that free speech zones and restrictive speech codes contradict the guarantees of the First Amendment. It recognizes that universities should protect the free and open exchange of ideas and that freedom of speech is worth protecting in a world increasingly hostile to democracy.

Through this resolution, I encourage the Secretary of Education to promote policies that encourage intellectual curiosity, viewpoint diversity, and debate. Last but not least, I encourage the Attorney General to defend and protect the First Amendment.

Standing by as universities surrender to activists who value their own comfort over the free exchange of ideas isn't just a mistake; it is a moral inversion.

We have a duty to make sure younger generations understand that protecting the First Amendment means pro-

tecting one another in the public square—even if we want more than anything to shut down what we are hearing. I may disagree with what you have to say, but I will defend your right to say it.

Above all, we have a duty to help them understand that an America where curiosity is replaced by suspicion, where debate is replaced by intimidation, and where speech is replaced by silence is no America at all.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 234—AFFIRMING THE UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO THE TWO-STATE SOLUTION TO THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT, AND NOTING THAT ISRAELI ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY IN THE WEST BANK WOULD UNDERMINE PEACE AND ISRAEL'S FUTURE AS A JEWISH AND DEMOCRATIC STATE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 234

Whereas longstanding United States policy has recognized that a two-state solution to achieve peace between the Israelis and Palestinians would serve as the best hope for peace and security in the region;

Whereas roadmaps for peace outlined by President Bill Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President Barack Obama reflected the bipartisan United States policy promoting a negotiated two-state solution that supports the self-determination of both Israelis and Palestinians;

Whereas successive United States administrations of different political parties identified settlement expansion as an impediment to peace;

Whereas Israel's status as a Jewish and democratic state has been indispensable to its national identity throughout its history;

Whereas Israel has built and maintained relationships with its Arab neighbors;

Whereas ongoing security coordination between Israelis and Palestinians promotes stability;

Whereas deep United States-Israel cooperation provides significant mutual benefit to the security and prosperity of both countries and strengthens the unbreakable bond between the people of each country; and

Whereas any resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must guarantee Israel's security: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the policy of the United States should be to preserve conditions conducive to a negotiated two-state solution;

(2) United States efforts to promote peace between the Israelis and Palestinians should explicitly endorse a two-state solution as the goal of any process to resolve the conflict's core issues;

(3) unilateral annexation of portions of the West Bank would jeopardize prospects for a two-state solution, harm Israel's relationship with its Arab neighbors, threaten Israel's Jewish and democratic identity, and undermine Israel's security; and

(4) a two-state solution is the best hope to preserve Israel's Jewish and democratic na-

ture while fulfilling the Palestinians' right to self-determination, creating a foundation for just and durable peace and prosperity.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 235—DESIGNATING JUNE 12, 2019, AS "WOMEN VETERANS APPRECIATION DAY"

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 235

Whereas, throughout all periods of the history of the United States, women have proudly served the United States to secure and preserve freedom and liberty for—

- (1) the people of the United States; and
- (2) the allies of the United States;

Whereas women have formally been a part of the United States Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901, but have informally served since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas women have served honorably and with valor, including—

- (1) disguised as male soldiers during the American Revolution and the Civil War;
- (2) as nurses during World War I and World War II; and
- (3) as combat helicopter pilots in Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of May 2019, women constitute approximately 15 percent of United States Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

- (1) nearly 19 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force;
- (2) 18 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;
- (3) 14 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;
- (4) 8 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and
- (5) nearly 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of May 2019, women constitute nearly 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas by 2020—

(1) the population of women veterans is expected to reach 2,000,000, which represents an exponential increase from 1,100,000 in 1980; and

(2) women veterans are expected to constitute more than 10 percent of the total veteran population;

Whereas the United States is proud of and appreciates the service of all women veterans who have demonstrated great skill, sacrifice, and commitment to defending the principles upon which the United States was founded and which the United States continues to uphold;

Whereas women veterans have unique stories and should be encouraged to share their recollections through the Veterans History Project, which has worked since 2000 to collect and share the personal accounts of wartime veterans in the United States; and

Whereas, by designating June 12, 2019, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day", the Senate can—

(1) highlight the growing presence of women in the Armed Forces and the National Guard; and

(2) pay respect to women veterans for their dutiful military service: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate designates June 12, 2019, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day" to recognize the service and sacrifices of women veterans who have served valiantly on behalf of the United States.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 236—RE-AFFIRMING THE STRONG PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN TUNISIA AND THE UNITED STATES AND SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF TUNISIA IN THEIR CONTINUED PURSUIT OF DEMOCRATIC REFORMS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 236

Whereas relations between the United States and Tunisia began in 1795, and the 2 countries have partnered in trade and security since the signing of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship, signed at Tunis, August 28, 1797;

Whereas the United States was the first major power to recognize a sovereign Tunisia, following its independence from France in 1956;

Whereas the people of the United States and of Tunisia share core values, such as respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law;

Whereas, on January 14, 2011, the peaceful mass protests of the Jasmine Revolution successfully brought to an end the authoritarian rule of President Ben Ali;

Whereas, in the aftermath of Ben Ali's resignation, Tunisians—

(1) initiated a peaceful, consensus-based, and inclusive transition to democracy;

(2) held the first competitive, multi-party democratic elections of the 2011 Arab Spring;

(3) adopted a new constitution in 2014; and

(4) held new elections under that constitution later that year;

Whereas, on December 31, 2014, after winning a free and fair presidential election, Beji Caid Essebsi was inaugurated as the first freely elected President of Tunisia;

Whereas, on October 9, 2015, the Norwegian Nobel Committee awarded the Tunisian National Dialogue Quartet, a coalition of 4 civil society organizations, the 2015 Nobel Peace Prize for the coalition's work—

(1) building on the promise of the 2011 Jasmine Revolution; and

(2) ensuring that the transition of Tunisia into a democracy did not descend into violence or renewed authoritarianism;

Whereas Tunisia has been the only North African country to achieve a "Free" rating by the Freedom House's annual Freedom in the World report, and has maintained a "Free" rating since 2015;

Whereas the political evolution of Tunisia stands as an inspiration for citizens of other states aspiring to establish the institutions of democracy after a history of autocratic rule;

Whereas Tunisia suffered significant terrorist attacks in 2015 and 2016;

Whereas, on October 29, 2018, a terrorist attack on Avenue Habib Bourguiba in Tunis wounded 20 people and was perpetrated by an unemployed university graduate who had been unemployed for 3 years and had no known ties to terrorist groups;

Whereas, in the aftermath of these attacks, citizens and leaders of Tunisia have reaffirmed their commitment to dialogue, pluralism, and democracy;

Whereas a significant number of Tunisian fighters for extremist groups, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) reportedly returned to Tunisia, many clandestinely, between 2011 and 2018;

Whereas Tunisia continues to face serious threats to its security from violent extremist groups operating within the country as well as in neighboring countries;

Whereas, in July 2015, President Obama designated Tunisia as a major non-NATO ally;

Whereas Tunisia has committed approximately 15 percent of its budget to defense and interior ministries for counterterrorism in recent years, at the expense of economic and social development;

Whereas Tunisia faces economic challenges, including high inflation and high unemployment, especially among young Tunisians;

Whereas the United States Government is committed to continuing a strong economic partnership with Tunisia as its government undertakes reforms to transform its economy to meet the aspirations of all of the citizens of Tunisia;

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States, and consistent with the values of the United States, to support the aspirations of the people of Tunisia in developing a pluralist democracy and transparent, effective institutions;

Whereas, in accordance with the United States-Tunisia strategic partnership, both countries are dedicated to working together to promote—

(1) economic development and business opportunities in Tunisia;

(2) education for the advancement of long-term development in Tunisia; and

(3) increased security cooperation to address common threats in Tunisia and across the region; and

Whereas the United States Government should provide a level of funding to strongly assist and reinforce Tunisia's promising transition into a democratic, stable, and prosperous nation:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the people of Tunisia for their commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and free and fair elections;

(2) commends the political leaders of Tunisia for their willingness to compromise and work together in the national interest;

(3) condemns all acts of terrorism, and extends condolences to the families of victims of terrorism and to the people and Government of Tunisia;

(4) commends the people and Government of Tunisia for their resilience in the face of terrorist attacks and their enduring commitment to a free, democratic, and peaceful Republic of Tunisia;

(5) encourages President Essebsi, Head of Government Chahed, and the Parliament of Tunisia to work together to accelerate economic reforms and anti-corruption measures;

(6) looks forward to new free and fair parliamentary and presidential elections scheduled for the last several months of 2019;

(7) calls on the Government of Tunisia—

(A) to fully implement the Tunisian Constitution of 2014, including the protection of civil liberties and the establishment of new institutions, such as the Constitutional Court;

(B) to continue its commitment to democratic accountability and transitional justice, including with regard to corruption;

(C) to continue decentralizing political power to local governments, which is a key step toward more accountable governance and a means to address long-standing issues of dramatic regional disparity in health care, education, poverty, and infrastructure; and

(D) to further develop its plan to identify, prosecute, deradicalize, or reintegrate into society Tunisian fighters returned from abroad;

(8) calls on the neighbors and partners of Tunisia to work cooperatively with the Government of Tunisia to counter terrorist threats, secure borders, and support the democratic transition of Tunisia;

(9) reaffirms the national interest of the United States in continued democracy in Tunisia, including—

(A) respect for the rule of law;

(B) independent media;

(C) a vibrant civil society; and

(D) universal rights and freedoms, including equal rights for all citizens and freedom of speech;

(10) affirms the national interest of the United States in Tunisia's economic prosperity and development, including through increased foreign direct investment, tourism, entrepreneurship, technical cooperation, and strengthened trade ties;

(11) reaffirms the commitment of the United States Government to Tunisia, including a commitment to provide appropriate levels of assistance, in support of the ongoing transition of Tunisia to an inclusive, prosperous, and secure democracy;

(12) recognizes important partnerships, including—

(A) the U.S.-Tunisia Strategic Dialogue;

(B) the U.S.-Tunisia Joint Military Commission;

(C) the U.S.-Tunisia Joint Economic Commission;

(D) the Tunisian American Enterprise Fund; and

(E) international educational exchange programs, including the Fulbright Program and the Thomas Jefferson Scholars Program;

(13) urges increased United States engagement and cooperation with the people and Government of Tunisia, including—

(A) Tunisia's democratic institutions;

(B) civil society;

(C) schools and universities;

(D) independent media; and

(E) the private sector; and

(14) reaffirms the historic and continuing friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Tunisia.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 237—SUPPORTING THE MISSION AND GOALS OF NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK IN 2019, WHICH INCLUDE INCREASING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE RIGHTS, NEEDS, AND CONCERNS OF, AND SERVICES AVAILABLE TO ASSIST, VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS OF CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 237

Whereas, in 2017, according to a survey by the Bureau of Justice Statistics—

(1) an estimated 5,600,000 violent victimizations were committed against residents of the United States who were 12 years of age or older; and

(2) households in the United States experienced an estimated 13,340,000 property victimizations;

Whereas, in 2017, only 45 percent of violent crimes and 36 percent of property victimizations were reported to police;

Whereas, as of 2015, the most conservative estimate for the economic losses sustained by victims of property crimes and victims of violent crime was approximately \$11,200,000,000 per year;

Whereas the economic cost alone does not fully describe the emotional, physical, and psychological impact endured by a victim of crime;

Whereas crime can touch the life of any individual, regardless of the age, race, national origin, religion, or gender of the individual;



Whereas a just society acknowledges the impact of crime on individuals, families, schools, and communities by—

(1) protecting the rights of crime victims and survivors; and

(2) ensuring that resources and services are available to help rebuild the lives of the victims and survivors, including victims' compensation to reimburse victims for out-of-pocket expenses due to crime;

Whereas, despite impressive accomplishments in increasing the rights of, and services available to, crime victims and survivors and the families of the victims and survivors, many challenges remain to ensure that all crime victims and survivors and the families of the victims and survivors are—

(1) treated with dignity, fairness, and respect;

(2) offered support and services, regardless of whether the victims and survivors report crimes committed against them; and

(3) recognized as key participants within the criminal, juvenile, Federal, and Tribal justice systems in the United States when the victims and survivors report crimes;

Whereas crime victims and survivors in the United States and the families of the victims and survivors need and deserve support and assistance to help cope with the often devastating consequences of crime;

Whereas, since Congress passed the first resolution designating Crime Victims Week in 1985, communities across the United States have joined Congress and the Department of Justice in commemorating National Crime Victims' Rights Week to celebrate a shared vision of a comprehensive and collaborative response that identifies and addresses the many needs of crime victims and survivors and the families of the victims and survivors;

Whereas Congress and the President agree on the need for a renewed commitment to serve all victims and survivors of crime in the 21st century;

Whereas, in 2019, National Crime Victims' Rights Week was celebrated from April 7 through April 13, and the theme, "Honoring our Past. Creating Hope for the Future.", celebrates the progress made by those before us as we look to a future of crime victim services that is even more inclusive, accessible, and trauma-informed;

Whereas engaging communities in victim assistance is essential in promoting public safety;

Whereas the United States must empower crime victims and survivors by—

(1) protecting the legal rights of the victims and survivors; and

(2) providing the victims and survivors with services to help them in the aftermath of crime; and

Whereas the people of the United States recognize and appreciate the continued importance of—

(1) promoting the rights of, and services for, crime victims and survivors; and

(2) honoring crime victims and survivors and individuals who provide services for the victims and survivors: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights Week, which include increasing individual and public awareness of—

(A) the impact of crime on victims and survivors and the families of the victims and survivors; and

(B) the challenges to achieving justice for victims and survivors of crime and the families of the victims and survivors and the many solutions available to meet those challenges; and

(2) recognizes that crime victims and survivors and the families of the victims and survivors should be treated with dignity, fairness, and respect.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 238—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JUNE 3 THROUGH JUNE 9, 2019, AS "HEMP HISTORY WEEK"

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. PAUL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 238

Whereas Hemp History Week will be held from June 3 through June 9, 2019;

Whereas the goals of Hemp History Week are to commemorate the historical relevance of industrial hemp in the United States and to promote the full growth potential of the industrial hemp industry;

Whereas industrial hemp is an agricultural commodity that has been used for centuries to produce many innovative industrial and consumer products, including soap, fabric, textiles, construction materials, clothing, paper, cosmetics, food, and beverages;

Whereas the global market for hemp is estimated to consist of more than 25,000 products;

Whereas the value of hemp imported into the United States for use in the production of other retail products is estimated at approximately \$76,000,000 annually;

Whereas the United States hemp industry estimates that the annual market value of hemp retail sales in the United States is more than \$1,000,000,000;

Whereas, despite the legitimate uses of hemp, agricultural producers of the United States were for decades prohibited under law from growing hemp;

Whereas, in December 2018, Congress established a legal framework for agricultural producers to cultivate, grow, and sell hemp in the United States;

Whereas the United States is the largest consumer of hemp products in the world; and Whereas industrial hemp holds great potential to bolster the agricultural economy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of June 3 through June 9, 2019, as "Hemp History Week";

(2) recognizes the historical relevance of industrial hemp; and

(3) recognizes the growing economic potential of industrial hemp.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 239—DESIGNATING JUNE 2019 AS "GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH"

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 239

Whereas hundreds of millions of people in the United States participate in outdoor recreation annually;

Whereas Congress enacted the Outdoor Recreation Jobs and Economic Impact Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-249; 130 Stat. 999) to assess and analyze the outdoor recreation economy of the United States and the effects attributable to the outdoor recreation economy on the overall economy of the United States;

Whereas the Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account released in September 2018 by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce shows that outdoor recreation contributed more than \$412,000,000,000 of current-dollar gross domestic product to the economy of the United

States in 2016, comprising approximately 2.2 percent of the current-dollar gross domestic product;

Whereas the Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account shows that the outdoor recreation sector experienced faster growth in real gross output, compensation, and employment than the overall economy in 2016, while also providing 4,546,000 jobs across the country;

Whereas the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-6) encouraged the Department of Commerce to continue its work with the Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account;

Whereas regular outdoor recreation is associated with positive health outcomes and better quality of life;

Whereas outdoor recreation is part of the national heritage of the United States; and

Whereas June 2019 is an appropriate month to designate as "Great Outdoors Month" to provide an opportunity to celebrate the importance of the great outdoors: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2019 as "Great Outdoors Month"; and

(2) encourages all people in the United States to recreate in the great outdoors in June 2019 and year-round.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19—CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 19

Whereas, on May 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy, Jr., before a joint session of Congress, declared, "Now it is time to take longer strides—time for a great new American enterprise—time for this Nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement, which in many ways may hold the key to our future on Earth", setting the goal of sending astronauts to the Moon and returning them safely to the Earth;

Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this preamble referred to as "NASA") mobilized and established the Apollo space program to meet the goal set by President Kennedy;

Whereas the Apollo space program built on the achievements of the prior space programs of NASA, including the Mercury and Gemini missions;

Whereas the successful Moon landing honored the tragic sacrifice of every astronaut whose life had previously been lost in the service of United States spaceflight research, including—

(1) Roger B. Chaffee, Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom, and Edward H. White II, the astronauts whose lives were lost during pre-flight tests for Apollo 1; and

(2) Theodore C. Freeman, Charles A. Bassett II, Elliot See, Jr., Robert H. Lawrence, Jr., Michael J. Adams, and Clifton C. Williams, Jr.;

Whereas the crew of the Apollo 11 mission consisted of—

(1) Neil Armstrong, Mission Commander;

(2) Edwin E. "Buzz" Aldrin, Lunar Module Pilot; and

(3) Michael Collins, Command Module Pilot;

Whereas James A. Lovell, Jr., Fred W. Haise, Jr., and William A. Anders stood ready to support or stand in for the Apollo 11 crew;

Whereas, on July 16, 1969, the Apollo 11 crew launched from the NASA Launch Operations Center, now known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center, aboard a Saturn V rocket;

Whereas, on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin landed the Eagle Lunar Module on the surface of the Moon, and Neil Armstrong said to Mission Control in Houston, Texas, "Houston, Tranquility Base here. The Eagle has landed.";

Whereas, when Neil Armstrong took the first step onto the Moon, he declared, "That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind.";

Whereas Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin planted the flag of the United States in lunar soil, recording the achievement of the country as the first to land on the Moon;

Whereas Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin placed a plaque on the Moon that reads, "We came in peace for all mankind", recording the peaceful, scientific intent of the Apollo missions;

Whereas the Apollo 11 crew collected lunar samples and conducted experiments to gain a better understanding of the composition of the Moon and conditions on its surface;

Whereas the Lunar Laser Ranging Retroreflector installed by the Apollo 11 crew is still used to measure the distance of the Moon from the surface of the Earth;

Whereas the success of the Apollo 11 Moon landing was due to the skill, dedication, and collective effort of tens of thousands of workers, scientists, engineers, and contractors of the United States;

Whereas the trajectory calculations of Katherine Johnson and other mathematicians in the computer pool at NASA were critical to the design of the Apollo 11 mission and the rendezvous of the Apollo 11 Lunar Lander with the Command and Service Module in lunar orbit;

Whereas the Apollo 11 mission demonstrated the focus and capability of the scientific community of the United States and established the United States as the world leader in space exploration;

Whereas the Apollo 11 Moon landing was broadcasted live over radio and television to millions across the world;

Whereas, 50 years later, the Apollo 11 Moon landing continues to inspire national scientific efforts in space, medicine, and other fields; and

Whereas the knowledge and experience gained from the Apollo space program continues to inform missions to Mars, the far reaches of the solar system, and beyond: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing;

(2) honors the bravery and skill of the crew of Apollo 11, Neil Armstrong, Edwin E. "Buzz" Aldrin, and Michael Collins;

(3) commends the efforts of all individuals of the United States who contributed to the achievement of the Apollo 11 Moon landing, exemplifying a cooperative effort on a national scale that continues to inspire scientific progress; and

(4) supports the continued leadership of the United States in the exploration and utilization of space through human spaceflight.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Thomas Peter Feddo, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Investment Security, Nazak Nikakhtar, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Industry and Security, and Ian Paul Steff, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, both of the Department of Commerce, Michelle Bowman, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Paul Shmotolokha, of Washington, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and Allison Herren Lee, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

#### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife.

#### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Peter Joseph Phipps, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, at a time to be determined, to conduct a hearing on the nomination of James Byrne, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted for the remainder of the day to my fellow, Dr. Kali Cyrus, and that they be granted for the rest of the year to the interns in my office, named Jyot Singh, Darcy Farwell, Alexandra Hartman, Jordan Sicklick, Holly McGrath, Jordan Adjepong, and Cady Stanton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 6

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

#### EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 28, 2019 AS "HONORING THE NATION'S FIRST RESPONDERS DAY"

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 108, S. Con. Res. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) expressing support for the designation of October 28, 2019, as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 1, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### MEASURING THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF BROADBAND ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1289 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1289) to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the effects of broadband deployment and adoption on the economy of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1289) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1289

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Measuring the Economic Impact of Broadband Act of 2019".

#### SEC. 2. ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS REGARDING THE EFFECT OF THE DIGITAL ECONOMY ON THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term "Assistant Secretary" means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(3) BROADBAND.—The term "broadband" means an Internet Protocol-based transmission service that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, or graphics, or a combination of those items.

(4) DIGITAL ECONOMY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term "digital economy" has the meaning given the term by the Secretary in carrying out this section.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing a definition for the term "digital economy" under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the digital-enabling infrastructure that a computer network needs to exist and operate; and

(ii) the roles of e-commerce and digital media.

(5) DIGITAL MEDIA.—The term "digital media" means the content that participants in e-commerce create and access.

(6) E-COMMERCE.—The term "e-commerce" means the digital transactions that take place using the infrastructure described in paragraph (4)(B)(i).

(7) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce and the Assistant Secretary, shall conduct an assessment and analysis regarding the contribution of the digital economy to the economy of the United States.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—In conducting each assessment and analysis required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) consider the impact of—

(A) the deployment and adoption of—

(i) digital-enabling infrastructure; and

(ii) broadband;

(B) e-commerce and platform-enabled peer-to-peer commerce; and

(C) the production and consumption of digital media, including free media; and

(2) consult with—

(A) the heads of any agencies and offices of the Federal Government as the Secretary considers appropriate, including the Secretary of Agriculture, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission;

(B) representatives of the business community, including rural and urban internet service providers and telecommunications infrastructure providers;

(C) representatives from State, local, and tribal government agencies; and

(D) representatives from consumer and community organizations.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report regarding the findings of the Secretary with respect to each assessment and analysis conducted under subsection (b).

#### PROTECTING AFFORDABLE MORTGAGES FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1749, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1749) to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1749) was passed, as follows:

S. 1749

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act of 2019".

#### SEC. 2. SEASONING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN REFINANCED MORTGAGE LOANS.

(a) GINNE MAE.—Section 306(g)(1) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)(1)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) VETERANS LOANS.—Section 3709(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking "is refinanced" and inserting "is a refinance"; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(1) the date on which the borrower has made at least six consecutive monthly payments on the loan being refinanced; and

"(2) the date that is 210 days after the first payment due date of the loan being refinanced.".

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to restrict or otherwise modify the authorities of the Government National Mortgage Association.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF JUNE 1, 2019, THROUGH JUNE 9, 2019, AS "NATIONAL FISHING AND BOATING WEEK"

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 174) expressing support for the designation of the week of June 1, 2019, through June 9, 2019, as "National Fishing and Boating Week".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 174) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 30, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 221 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 221) recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre and condemning the intensifying repression and human rights violations by the Chinese Communist Party and the use of surveillance by Chinese authorities.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 221) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, was printed in the RECORD of May 23, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 237, S. Res. 238, and S. Res. 239.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolutions en bloc.

The resolutions (S. Res. 237, S. Res. 238, and S. Res. 239) were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preambles be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES 20 AND S.J. RES. 26

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to S.J. Res. 20 and S.J. Res. 26, Senator PAUL, or his designee, be recognized at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, but no later than June 14, to make a motion to discharge such resolution; further, that there be up to an hour of debate on each motion, equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, with 7 minutes reserved for both the chairman and the ranking member respectively, prior to each vote; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the motion to discharge; further, that if either motion to discharge is agreed to, the joint resolution be eligible for the expedited procedures under the Arms Export Control Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 2019, AND MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business conducted on Thursday, June 6, at 10:30 a.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, June 6, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, June 10, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Holte nomination. Finally, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen upon disposition of the Hertling nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will vote on confirmation of the Holte, Alston, Jr., and Hertling nominations, as well as cloture on the Morrison nomination, in the order listed at 5:30 p.m., Monday, June 10.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 2019, AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:21 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 6, 2019, at 10:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

AMY KARPEL, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2023, VICE IRVING A. WILLIAMSON, TERM EXPIRED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KELLEY ECKELS CURRIE, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KENNETH CHARLES CANTERBURY, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES, VICE BYRON TODD JONES, RESIGNED.

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. ERIC P. WENDT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL R. BERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be brigadier general*

COL. CURTIS A. BUZZARD  
COL. ANDREW C. HILMES  
COL. PATRICK R. MICHAELIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### *To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH L. BIEHLER  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM B. BLAYLOCK II  
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS R. BOUCHARD  
BRIG. GEN. PAUL B. CHAUNCEY III  
BRIG. GEN. JOHANNA P. CLYBORNE  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. EDWARDS  
BRIG. GEN. LEE M. ELLIS  
BRIG. GEN. PABLO ESTRADA, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. LAPTHE C. FLORA  
BRIG. GEN. TROY D. GALLOWAY  
BRIG. GEN. LEE W. HOPKINS  
BRIG. GEN. MARVIN T. HUNT  
BRIG. GEN. MARK C. JACKSON  
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD F. JOHNSON  
BRIG. GEN. TIM C. LAWSON  
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN D. LYONS  
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. MITCHELL  
BRIG. GEN. MICHEL A. NATALI  
BRIG. GEN. CHAD J. PARKER  
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY C. PORTER  
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY D. SMILEY  
BRIG. GEN. DAVID N. VESPER

##### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

##### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. HUAN T. NGUYEN

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

##### *To be lieutenant colonel*

JASON A. KOSKINEN

##### *To be major*

ROBIN T. BINGHAM

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

SEAN C. HEIDGERKEN  
JOHN J. HOSEY, JR.  
EDWARD J. LYNCH  
STEVEN R. MEEK  
STEPHEN J. MIKO  
JOHN F. POPIAK  
MICHAEL J. SIEBER  
CLINT E. TRACY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

JESSE ABREU  
GERARD M. ACOSTA  
TRAVIS D. ADKINS  
KEVIN W. AGNESS  
RICKY L. ALLBRITTON  
WILLETTE L. ALSTONWILLIAMS  
CHRISTOPHER W. ANDERSON  
DAPHNE H. AUSTIN  
BRETT A. AYVAZIAN  
ROB W. BARNHILL  
SHARI R. BENNETT  
SCOTT M. BISHOP  
PAUL M. BONANO  
ERIC L. BOOKER  
PETER A. BOOKER  
LUCAS J. A. BRAXTON  
ANDRE L. BROWN  
JACOB M. BROWN  
TAVI N. BRUNSON  
NATHANAEL D. BRYANT  
THOMAS A. BUCHHOLZ  
BEIRE D. CASTRO  
FAITH M. CHAMBERLAIN  
BONNIE B. B. CLEMENTE  
CHRISTOPHER F. CONLEY  
RALPH M. CRUM  
ELIZABETH H. CURTIS  
KANDACE M. DAFFIN  
BOBBY H. DAVIS  
ERIC B. DENNIS  
KHANH T. DIEP  
ANTHONY E. DOUGLAS  
ANDREW J. DUUS  
ANGEL R. ESTRADA  
CARL J. FAISON  
NICOLE E. FISCHER  
JAMES M. GALLAGHER  
JAMES E. GANNON  
CEDRIC D. GASKIN, JR.  
ERIN M. GILLIAM  
ANH H. HA  
MICHAEL D. HAGERTY, JR.  
MICHAEL F. HAMMOND  
JOSEPH M. HERMAN  
CRYSTAL M. HILLS  
NED C. HOLT  
DANIEL L. HORN  
RYAN A. HOWELL  
YU K. HU  
ANTHONY E. HUGHLEY  
ROBIN D. HUSTED  
FRANK E. JEFFERSON, JR.  
BENJAMIN G. JOHNSON  
ERIK C. JOHNSON  
LEE M. JOHNSON  
JEFFERY W. JURAND  
SHAWN L. KADLEC  
ROBERT L. KELLAM  
BRIAN J. KETZ  
DAVID P. KEY  
GREGORY W. LEIPHART  
ANDREW S. LUNOFF  
MICHAEL R. MAI  
TIMOTHY E. MATTHEWS  
CRAIG H. MCILWAIN  
JAMES W. MCKENNA  
BRETT M. MEDLIN  
JOHN G. MISENHEIMER, JR.  
MARK S. MORGAN  
JARED P. NOVAK  
ROBERT L. PETROSKY, JR.  
KEVIN M. POLOSKEY  
GRETA A. RAILSBACK  
JOE A. RATLIFF  
TONI M. RIEKE  
PERNELL A. ROBINSON  
RIZALDO D. L. SALVADOR  
GINA D. SANNICOLAS  
JOHN L. SCHIMMING  
MICHAEL G. SCHOONOVER  
JUSTIN R. SHELL  
SHAWANTA D. SMART  
ADAM D. SMITH  
LANCE M. SNEED  
MICHAEL P. SOLOVEY  
JENNY T. STACY  
NATASHA J. STANLEY  
TONEY R. STEPHENSON  
JEREMY L. STLAURENT  
TIMOTHY SUGARS  
JASON F. TATE  
STACY M. TOMIC  
KECIA M. TROY  
SANTÉE B. VASQUEZ  
LISA A. VILARREALRENNARD  
JEFFREY E. WAGSTAFF  
RALPH L. WARE  
MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS  
MICHELLE M. WILLIAMS  
ANTHONY L. WILSON  
JULIA A. WILSON

ROBERT J. WOLFE  
JOSEPH W. YOUNG  
JAMES J. ZACCHINO, JR.  
D001385  
D006471

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

RICHARD R. ABELKIS  
LEONARDO ADAMS  
CHRISTOPHER H. BACHMANN  
STEPHEN J. BANKS  
THEODORE A. BANNER  
JACQUELYN M. BARCOMB  
LEE A. BARNARD  
DEREK S. BICKLER  
JAMES N. BLAIN, JR.  
LOUIVA J. BRADLEY  
LOUIVE K. BROGAN  
DONALD K. BROOKS  
ANDREW R. BROWN  
JOSEPH P. BUCCINO  
GEOFFREY R. BULL  
MATTHEW D. BUTT  
KATHLEEN S. CAGE  
ERICA L. CAMERON  
JASON L. CAMPBELL  
KWOK F. CHIU  
ANDREW P. CLARK  
SEAN P. COAKLEY  
JONATHAN D. CORNETT  
RANDY R. COTE  
JULIA O. COXEN  
ZACHARY W. COYAN  
MICHAEL P. CULLINANE  
STEVEN B. CUNNINGHAM  
STEPHEN M. DAIL  
VICTOR M. DEEKENS  
CHRISTOPHER S. DENHAM  
MARK A. DENTON  
TRAVIS J. DOLAN  
BRIAN J. FICKEL  
BRIAN P. FLEMING  
JOSHUA A. GILLEN  
JOSEPH C. GUIDO, JR.  
BRETT I. HANSON  
EDMOND A. HARDY  
MATTHEW W. HEIM  
MATTHEW E. HELBERG  
CAROL M. HICKEY  
ANDREW J. HIBERSTETTER  
KEITH D. HOCKMAN  
ZACHARY B. HOHN  
RICHARD C. HYDE  
KIRK A. INGOLD  
JOHN M. IVES  
BRIAN P. JACOBSON  
CRAIG S. JAYSON  
JAMES R. JOHNSON  
BRIAN M. JORGENSEN  
BRIAN M. KADET  
CHARLES J. KARELS  
MINDY A. KIMBALL  
RICHARD A. KIPHUTH  
DIANE E. KLEIN  
MATTHEW D. KOEHLER  
ERIK E. KOENIG  
CHRISTOPHER M. KORPELA  
MICHAEL T. KOSUDA  
KANAME K. KUNIYUKI II  
KARLTON L. LANE  
MARK J. LAVIN II  
ALEX M. LEONOVICH  
THEODORE T. LIEBREICH  
MICHAEL I. MAHARAJ  
CHRISTOPHER E. MARKS  
CHRISTOPHER S. MARTIN  
CHRISTOPHER M. MARTINEZ  
RAYMOND M. MATTOX  
MICHAEL E. MCARTHUR  
DAVIS K. MCELWAIN  
KEITH D. MCMANUS  
ZACHARY F. MILLER  
MATTHEW J. MOAKLER  
DANIEL R. MORRIS  
IAN H. MURRAY  
RICHARD J. NOWINSKI  
MARTIN L. O'DONNELL  
CHRISTOPHER J. ORTIONA  
DAVID E. OWENS  
BYRON G. PATERAS  
KRISTY K. PERRY  
ROBERT E. PETTY V  
ROBERT W. PHILLIPS  
GREGORY D. PIPES  
BRANDON A. PRESSLEY  
WAYNE E. PRINCE  
MATTHEW R. PROVOST  
PABLO A. RAGGIO  
MANUEL F. RAGMIREZ  
JOHN M. REEDER  
KLAUDIUS K. ROBINSON  
JOSEPH A. ROMAN  
JAMES M. ROSS  
KENNETH J. RUTKA, JR.  
TONI K. SABO  
CADE M. SAIE  
ADAM A. SANNUOTTI  
DARCY L. L. SCHNACK  
MICHAEL S. SCIOLETTI  
COREY N. SHEA  
BRYAN P. SHRANK  
JAMES A. SINK  
DONALD E. SMITH II

SAMUEL P. SMITH, JR.  
SANG M. SOK  
DAVID K. SPENCER  
MICHAEL P. STACHOUR  
RYAN P. STAMATIS  
JOEY J. SULLINGER  
CHRISTOPHER S. SYNOWIEZ  
MICHAEL D. TETER  
JOSHUA P. TRIMBLE  
JAMES O. TURNER, JR.  
NICOLE E. VINSON  
DAVID E. VIOLAND  
STEVEN B. WALDROP  
MARK R. WHITEMAN  
CHIKE T. WILLIAMS  
WINSTON S. WILLIAMS, JR.  
CARL J. WOJITASZEK  
DANIEL C. WOOD II  
BRENDA D. ZOLLINGER  
D006093  
D013144  
D013328  
D014376  
G010416  
G010471  
G010532

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY  
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

VINCENT A. AMERENA  
RONALD E. ANZALONE  
THOMAS J. ARRIAGA  
ANTHONY P. BARINA  
STEPHEN L. BATTLE  
HENRY M. BENNETT, JR.  
AARON D. BOHRER  
MANDI L. BOHRER  
GARY S. BONHAM  
JAMES L. BOOTH  
JOSEPH S. BRANNON  
JAY W. BROOKE  
LOYD W. BROWN  
SEAN M. BROWN  
DANFORD W. BRYANT II  
DARREN W. BUSS  
THOMAS A. CALDWELL  
GREGORY V. CAMPION  
JOHN P. CARSON IV  
JOHN M. CASIANO  
JASON A. CLARKE  
JASON T. COOK  
JESSE T. CURRY  
ADAM J. CZEKANSKI  
RICHARD J. DAVIS  
WILLIAM L. DAVIS  
DAMON A. DELAROSA  
MATTHEW B. DENNIS  
HANNON A. DIDER  
ETHAN J. DIVEN  
DWIGHT D. DOMENEGEAUX, JR.  
SEAN P. DONNELLY  
PATRICK A. DOUGLAS  
BRIAN M. DUCOTE  
SAMUEL G. EDWARDS  
JAMES M. EGAN  
SCOTT J. EMMEL  
JOHN V. EVANS, JR.  
CHAD A. FROELICH  
JON R. GARDNER  
JOSEPH R. GEARY  
JOHN J. GEIS III  
BRIAN J. GERBER  
WADE J. GERMANN  
DANIEL C. GIBSON  
JOHN B. GILLAM  
MICHAEL GOMEZ  
MATTHEW J. GOMLAK  
MATTHEW F. GOODING  
STEVEN E. GVENTER  
JEREMY T. GWINN  
JEFFREY D. HALL  
BRIAN P. HALLBERG  
BRYAN M. HARRIS  
JONATHAN L. HARVEY  
MARCUS C. HAY  
RALPH D. HEATON  
MICHAEL D. HELTON  
BRIAN T. HOFFMAN  
KYLE M. HOGAN  
ROBERT J. HOLCOMBE  
RONALD J. HUGHES  
RICHARD J. IKENA, JR.  
SEDRICK L. JACKSON  
TRAVIS A. JACOBS  
ERIC JACOBSON  
JEREMY W. JAMES  
ANDREW Q. JORDAN  
CHRISTOPHER E. JUDGE  
STEPHEN M. KAPLACHINSKI  
DEREK R. KELLER  
ZACHARY D. KERNS  
JAMES A. KIEVIT  
CHRISTOPHER J. KIRK  
ANDREW J. KISER  
DAMON M. KNARR  
ADAM J. LACKEY  
PHILIP H. LAMB  
JEFFREY J. LESPERANCE  
CHRISTOPHER M. LEUNG  
RYAN F. LEVESQUE  
ADAM J. LEWIS  
ALEXANDER C. LOVASZ  
ADAM L. LOWMASTER  
SHARON R. LYGHT

TIMOTHY M. MAHONEY  
MICHAEL J. MANNION  
CHRISTOPHER M. MARQUEZ  
ELIZABETH A. MARTIN  
JARRET D. MATHEWS  
ROBERT W. MATTHEWS  
BRIAN E. MCCARTHY  
SEAN P. MCGEE  
THURMAN C. MCKENZIE  
SCOTT W. MCLELLAN  
ROBERT B. MCNELLIS  
JON W. MEREDITH  
KEYES M. METCALF  
CARY J. METZ  
JACOB W. MILLER  
JAMES M. MITCHELL  
PATRICK C. MOFFETT  
PETER J. MOON  
JOHN D. MORIS  
MICHAEL G. MOUROUZIS  
CARLOS E. MOYA  
JEFFREY M. MUNN  
THOMAS D. MURPHY, JR.  
JENNIFER A. MYKINS  
BRIAN J. NEWILL  
DAVID A. NORRIS  
LANCE A. OBRYAN  
CHRISTOPHER W. OGWIN  
DAVID J. PAINTER  
FREDRICK B. PARKER  
MARC E. PELINI  
SCOTT A. PENCE  
ESTHER S. PINCHASIN  
DANIEL P. RAYCA  
GINA M. RICHARDSMCCLOSKEY  
ALEXIS RIVERAESPADA  
JASON H. ROSENSTRAUCH  
MATTHEW L. ROWLAND  
JOSHUA R. RUISANCHEZ  
KAREN L. RUTKA  
JOHN W. SANDOR  
VICTOR R. SATTERLUND  
BRIAN P. SCHOELLHORN  
GERALD P. SCHUCK  
JONATHAN K. SHAFFNER  
KEVIN R. SHARP  
MICHAEL J. SHOUSE  
KENT G. SOLHEIM  
ANDREW C. STEADMAN  
MICHAEL P. STEWART  
TED L. STOKES, JR.

MICHAEL A. STONE  
JONATHAN S. STOVER  
NATHAN S. SURREY  
DANIEL L. SWANSON  
KELVIN P. SWINT  
STEPHEN C. TAYLOR  
DOUGLAS M. THOMAS  
JASON C. TOWNSEND  
MATTHEW P. TUCKER  
RICHARD P. TUCKER  
DARYL S. VONHAGEL  
KARIN L. WATSON  
MARCUS S. WELCH  
JASON L. WEST  
SETH A. WHEELER  
MICHAEL T. WHITNEY  
KIRK J. WHITTENBERGER  
ROBERT J. WISHAM  
TIMOTHY L. WOODRUFF  
MARCUS W. WRIGHT  
MATTHEW T. ZIGLAR  
D002263  
D005922  
D006292  
D010375  
D011554  
D014888  
D014896

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

MARTIN E. ROBERTS  
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY  
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be captain*

TODD W. GEYER  
ERIC C. MCAFEE  
ANTHONY J. SMOLA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by  
the Senate June 5, 2019:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

HEATH P. TARBERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRMAN  
OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION.  
HEATH P. TARBERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2024.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUSAN COMBS, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID SCHENKER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
AS COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 6043:

*To be general*

LT. GEN. DAVID H. BERGER

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by  
the President to the Senate on June 5,  
2019 withdrawing from further Senate  
consideration the following nomination:

AMY KARPEL, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF  
THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING  
JUNE 16, 2020, VICE F. SCOTT KIEFF, RESIGNED, WHICH  
WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 16, 2019.